



Library of

Wellesley



College.

Presented by

Mr. A. A. Sweet.

No 33991

CLARKE & CARRUTH  
MERCHANTS













*N. B. Davidson*

THE  
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

*THIRD SERIES.*

Volume VI.

*WITH ETCHING OF REV. ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D.  
BY H. MANESSE.*

London :

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,  
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXVII.

[*All rights reserved.*]

33991

BUTLER & TANNER,  
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,  
FROME, AND LONDON.

B3  
410  
E7  
VI.3

## Contributors to Volume VI.

---

- REV. PRINCIPAL JOSEPH ANGUS, D.D.  
REV. PROF. JOSEPH AGAR BEET.  
REV. PROF. W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D.  
REV. PRINCIPAL DAVID BROWN, D.D.  
VERY REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D.  
REV. F. H. CHASE, M.A.  
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.  
VERY REV. R. W. CHURCH, D.C.L.  
REV. PROF. S. IVES CURTISS, D.D., PH.D.  
REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.  
REV. PROF. F. DELITZSCH, D.D.  
REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.  
REV. PROF. S. R. DRIVER, D.D.  
REV. PROF. G. G. FINDLAY, B.A.  
REV. PROF. F. GODET, D.D.  
REV. ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D.  
REV. PROF. W. MILLIGAN, D.D.  
T. E. PAGE, M.A.  
REV. PROF. G. SALMON, D.C.L., F.R.S., CORR.  
Inst., France.  
REV. PROF. S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D.  
G. A. SIMCOX, M.A.  
REV. A. MOODY STUART, D.D.  
REV. CHARLES TAYLOR, D.D.  
REV. PROF. B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L.  
THE EDITOR.





*THE LATTER RAIN.*

Is the good seed sown to die?  
Does the ploughman labour in vain  
When the glory fails from the sky,  
When the elouds return after the rain?  
Nay; pine not for noonday splendour,  
Nor fear for the blinding leven,

Do not even look for His coming, who shall come in secret to  
bless.

As yet when He boweth His heaven  
There is darkness under His feet,  
But the darkness is deep and tender,  
And the air is cool and sweet;

And wheresoever He passeth the parchèd fields are green,  
Where the ears wax heavy to harvest, while the Sun of righteous-  
ness  
Shines seldom upon His chosen with a flash that is felt, not  
seen.

Though the sky of spring was bright,  
And the flowers of spring were gay,  
It was only a brief delight,  
Ere we tasted it withered away.  
But after the blue spring weather,  
And the silent summer showers,

The golden corn shall abide, that as many as sow and reap  
May comfort themselves for the flowers  
In the shorter, brighter days,  
And rejoice for awhile together  
Till again on the wint'ry ways

The sower goes to his labour after the harvest mirth,  
And One cometh in darkness behind him as the year sinks down to  
sleep,  
As the rain to a fleece of wool, as the drops that water the earth.

When the tale of the years is ended, and summer and winter past,  
When the one great harvest ripens over all the earth at last,  
The Sun shall shine like lightning, for ever from east to west,  
To gather the sowers and reapers to the everlasting rest.

G. A. SIMCOX.

---

*THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.*

IN saying that speculations concerning the origin of the Christian ministry have for me only a historical interest, I had better give an illustration which will explain my meaning. The disputes between Charles I. and his parliament gave rise to controversies as to the relative powers of kings and parliaments, which continued to be carried on long after that monarch's death. In these controversies large use was made of arguments drawn from history, and the origin of parliaments was investigated mainly with a view to practical consequences to which the results arrived at were expected to lead. At the present day the investigation of the origin of parliaments has a purely historical interest, and the conclusions which the student may arrive at are not likely to affect in any way his allegiance to the now settled constitution of the country. In like manner I count that the duty on the part of the individual to submit to the settled constitution of the Church is not affected, whatever be the true history of the process by which, in God's providence, the constitution of the Church was established. In any case, it is a sin to rend Christ's body by causeless schisms. I feel therefore quite free to accept any conclusions as to the history of the beginnings of Christianity to which the evidence may lead us, without any apprehension that I shall be thereby forced to alter my position with regard to modern controversies. As Dr.

Sanday's investigations are quite unprompted by any desire to bring out a foreseen result, his general way of looking at the subject is the same as mine, and any criticisms I may offer on his paper will relate to matters of detail. My differences with him are not many, and they chiefly arise from the fact that there are a few authorities to which we do not attach the same value.

Renan, in the preface to his second volume, has very well expressed the duty of a historian, however ill he may himself have acted on it; *viz.* to represent what is certain as certain, what is probable as probable, what is only possible as possible. I have read many interesting speculations concerning early Church history, with which my chief quarrel is on account of a breach of this rule. It must be borne in mind how very few documents we have dating from the last quarter of the first century and the first half of the second; and of these few how large a part there is which throws little light on the early history of the Church. Where historical light is dim we are bound to walk warily; and if we are forced to piece out proofs with conjectures, we are not justified in laying stress on our conclusions as if they were proved facts.

I have elsewhere described the paucity of documents dating from the age immediately succeeding the apostolic, by saying that Church history passes through a tunnel. We have good light where we have the books of the New Testament to guide us, and good light again when we come down to the abundant literary remains of the latter part of the second century; but there is an intervening period, here and there faintly illumined by a few documents giving such scanty and interrupted light as may be afforded by the air-holes of a tunnel. If in our study of this dimly lighted portion of the history we wish to distinguish what is certain from what is doubtful, we may expect to find the things certain in what can be seen from either of the two

well lighted ends. If the same thing is visible on looking from either end, we can have no doubt of its existence.

Such a thing I take to be the existence of the Christian ministry as a distinct order. That the distinction between clergy and laity was recognised at the end of the second century is so notorious that detailed proof is superfluous. We never lose sight of the distinction as we trace the history back. When we come to one of the earliest of extra-canonical writings, the *Epistle of Clement*, the distinction between the clergy and laity is well marked. The former office is so regarded as permanent, that the deposition of a presbyter against whom no grave offence can be charged is treated as a sin. When we turn to the New Testament writings, we find, in the oldest document in the collection, the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (v. 12), a class of men commended as highly deserving, for their work's sake, of the esteem and love of those addressed; and these are described as "labouring among them," as "being over them in the Lord," and "as admonishing them." From the second of these phrases we infer that the persons described held permanent office in the Church, and from the third that the "work in which they laboured," if at all secular, was not entirely so. This completely harmonizes with the admonition in a later epistle (Heb. xiii. 17), "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give an account." It is needless to produce other New Testament testimony, for I regard it as beyond dispute that the Church from the first had officers, charged not merely with secular but with spiritual duties. What gradations of office there were, and what things there were which a clergyman might do and a layman might not, are points remaining for inquiry.

Let us then commence our further investigations with the end of the second century, a period as to which wit-

nesses are so numerous that our conclusions may fairly be presented as certain. For this reason it is with the same period I have found it convenient to begin when investigating the canon of the New Testament. Both with regard to the canon and to the Christian ministry, we find the same leading ideas holding sway at the end of the second century which have been dominant in the Church ever since. We find at that time the clergy existing, not only as a distinct order in the Church, but with marked gradations of rank. Each Church is then presided over by a single person, known by the title of bishop. We can well believe that his power was not autocratic; but on this point direct evidence is wanting, for at the period of which I speak each Church appears to have followed cheerfully the guidance of the trusted man at its head, and so there are not data to determine what the result would have been if their president had attempted to impose his decisions on a reluctant Church.

At this period, not only is episcopacy everywhere prevalent, but there is no idea that the constitution of the Church had ever been different. The heretics who were then most formidable claimed to be in possession of secret traditions derived from the Apostles, though not recorded in the New Testament; and in these traditions they pretended to have authority for their peculiar tenets. One way of meeting this claim was to deny that the Apostles had taught anything privately which they had not also taught publicly. But another answer was also given; namely, that if any such traditions there were, it was not in the schools of the heretics they were to be looked for, but in those Churches which had been founded by Apostles, and could trace the succession of their bishops up to them. This argument is developed by Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, book iii.) in a work written about A.D. 180 or not long after. Though claiming to be able to enumerate, in the case of different

Churches, the succession of bishops from the days when they were founded by Apostles down to his own time, he says that space will not permit him to give the successions for all the Churches, and that it will suffice him to give the succession for the greatest and most ancient and best known Church, the Church of Rome. With its doctrine will agree the doctrine of every other Church which has preserved the apostolic tradition. He then enumerates the succession of Roman bishops, beginning with Linus, whom he represents as appointed bishop by Peter and Paul, who had founded the Church of Rome, and ending with Eleutherus, who was bishop when he wrote. This list, we may reasonably believe, was identical with one previously made by Hegesippus, and apparently with the same object; namely, to make it probable that Churches which had apostolic succession had apostolic doctrine. The list of Hegesippus (see Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 22) purports to have been made by him when at Rome during the episcopate of Anicetus, who, according to Lipsius, died A.D. 167; and at the time of publication Hegesippus adds that to Anicetus succeeded Soter, and to Soter, Eleutherus, who had been deacon to Anicetus.

In the place just cited, Irenæus speaks of the celebrated Polycarp, whom in his youth he had known personally. In order to give weight to Polycarp's testimony to apostolic tradition, Irenæus says that Polycarp not only had conversed with many who had seen Christ, but also had been appointed by Apostles in Asia as bishop of the Church of Smyrna. Probably what Irenæus meant by "Apostles" is the same as is expressed by Tertullian, who, writing a little later (*De Præscrip.* 32), speaks of Polycarp as having been placed over the Church of Smyrna by St. John. The now accepted date for Polycarp's martyrdom is A.D. 155, and he was then not less than eighty-six years of age, so that there is no chronological impossibility in his having had personal



intercourse with Apostles, whether or not we think the evidence for the fact sufficient.

To return to Irenæus, it must be mentioned that to the rulers of the Churches, whom he calls bishops, he also, and sometimes in the same context, gives the title presbyters or elders. Thus the passage just quoted, in which he argues that the apostolicity of the current tradition of the Churches is guaranteed by the succession of their bishops, is introduced by a sentence in which, having plainly the same argument in view, he speaks of the succession of their *presbyters*. Again, addressing Victor, bishop of Rome, he speaks of "the presbyters before Soter who ruled the Church which thou now guidest." It must be remembered that "elder" was, not only the name of a Church office, but also a title of honour. It is used, for instance, by Papias, in speaking of the Apostles and other men of the first generation of Christians, much as we might speak of "the Fathers." John, in his second and third epistles, describes himself as "the elder," and St. Peter (v. 1) claims the same title. It may be concluded, that in the language of Irenæus every bishop was a presbyter; but it does not follow conversely that in his language every presbyter was a bishop.

It is quite true that in the Church of the times under discussion the district under the immediate superintendence of a bishop was ordinarily much smaller than in our present arrangements; and that many a small town would then have a bishop which in the modern Church would be ministered to by a presbyter or presbyters, subject to the oversight of the bishop of some neighbouring great city. The probable reason of the difference is, that now the city is connected with a neighbouring town by a continuous line of Christians, living all through the intervening district; in the second century the rural population were for the most part, as the name implies, pagans, and each town was an independent centre of Christian life. The consequence was,

that in the Church of the second century the total number of bishops bore to the total number of mere presbyters a larger proportion than in the Church of modern times. But it is quite misleading to produce this fact when we are inquiring whether or not there were some presbyters to whom no one gave the title of bishop. Now there is no evidence that at the beginning of the third century more than one person in any city was entitled to be called bishop,<sup>1</sup> although there were many cities in which the number of Christians was so large that it is incredible that they could only have been ministered to by a single presbyter. Thus the passage from Irenæus just referred to shows that the Church of Rome was in his day under the rule of a single person, and that he believed that the same constitution had existed in previous days. Victor ruled the Church then; Soter had ruled it in a former generation; and before Soter the Church had had other governors of the same kind. Yet that there were in Rome presbyters in the plural number appears from Hermas; and the same thing is shown by the account, certainly derived from an ancient authority, which Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 42) gives of the discussions of Marcion with the presbyters of Rome. We actually know the names of two presbyters at Rome during the episcopate of Victor, *viz.* Florinus and Blastus, their names having been preserved on account of their having been deposed for heresy or schism. There is extant a fragment of a letter of Irenæus to Victor, in which the name presbyter is applied to this Florinus.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hatch (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 102) speaks of this rule as not firmly established until the dispute between Cornelius and Novatian in the middle of the third century. For this assertion he offers no proof whatever. Cyprian certainly treats it as a monstrous and impious thing, that when one bishop had been duly elected, another should be ordained; but there is no evidence that this view was then either novel or singular. Novatian no doubt had a respectable following, but there is no evidence that he claimed to be anything less than *the* bishop of Rome, or that either he or any of those who acknowledged him as bishop of Rome acknowledged Cornelius also as bishop.



Before parting with the period of which I speak, *viz.* the end of the second century and the beginning of the third, I ought not to omit to mention a work brought to Rome about this time, which undoubtedly had great influence in exalting the claims of the Roman bishop; I mean the history of the preaching of Peter, which, whatever may have been its earlier form, was then published as a work of the Roman Clement, and represented this Clement as ordained by Peter to take his place as bishop of Rome. We reject this story as apocryphal, and account the document which contains it as of no authority for the events of the first century. But the document is notwithstanding of great value for the light which it throws on the period when it was published. A historical novel is quite worthless if offered as evidence that the events it relates really took place; but it is excellent evidence that things commended themselves as probable to the author's sense of fitness and to those readers who accepted it as a true representation of former occurrences. Now the system of Church government which in these *Clementines* is assumed to have been universal is strongly monarchical and episcopal. At the head of the whole Church is James, the bishop of Jerusalem. He is bishop of bishops, and to him even Peter must render periodical accounts of his mission. When Peter in the course of his preaching establishes a Church anywhere, he leaves behind a bishop to rule over it. Directions are given concerning the presbyters, who are to teach in each Church, and concerning the deacons, who are to be the eyes of the bishop. In Clement's letter addressed to James and his Church, there are coupled with James in the inscription "the presbyters and deacons, and all the rest of the brethren."

It has been thought by many that the Church derived its officers from the synagogue; and on this account more weight may be attached to the evidence of a document so

intensely Jewish as the *Clementines*. At all events, it is quite clear that the writer conceived it to be a matter of necessity that every Church should have a bishop, presbyters, and deacons. And this conception was evidently in accordance with the prevalent notions of the Church of the day, which, though it refused to accept the heretical doctrine of the book, yet found nothing to shock its sense of probability in the historical representations of the book, and accordingly wisely accepted them as true. It would be easy to give other proofs, but I will not elaborate proof of a point that cannot be seriously contested; namely, that at the end of the second century every Church was ruled by a bishop, with presbyters and deacons under him; and that it was generally taken for granted that such had been the constitution of the Church from the first, no memory of any other state of things being then surviving. This is one of the things that may fairly be regarded as certain.

Now the general opinion of the Church at the end of the second century concerning its early constitution is certainly entitled to much respect. Just as we think that the Church of that day was likely to be right in its belief that the four gospels, which were then held in universal and exclusive honour, really had descended to it from apostolic times, so there is a presumption, which must hold good until it is displaced, that the Church of that day was right in believing that the Church constitution then universally prevalent did descend to it from apostolic times. Now if we trace the history backward we find nothing to displace this presumption, and much to confirm it. From the absence of opposing evidence, this may be concluded with certainty, that there never had been any violent or abrupt change in the form of Church government. Such a change must have excited controversies which must have left an abiding trace in Church history. And any such change must have been in its nature local, and could not have

established itself without remark all over the Christian world. If therefore the original constitution of the Church were not the same as we find it in the days of Irenæus, the former must at least have been capable of developing itself into the latter by means of changes, silent and gradual, and resulting from causes universal in their operation.

The necessary limitations of space forbid me to go into much detail as to the second century evidence. We can go back immediately to the episcopate of Soter, whose name I have just quoted from Irenæus. A letter from Dionysius of Corinth to the Church of Rome acknowledges a gift of money sent to the Church of Corinth by the Church of Rome through "their blessed bishop Soter." The chronology of Lipsius assigns to the episcopate of Soter eight or nine years, ending A.D. 174 or 175. The correspondence of this Dionysius makes incidental mention of other contemporary bishops: Palmas in Pontus, Philip and Pinytus in Crete, and of a previous bishop, Publius, at Athens, who had suffered martyrdom, and had been succeeded by one Quadratus. Dionysius states that Dionysius the Areopagite had been appointed first bishop of Athens by St. Paul. Of course I make no other use of this statement than as showing that in the year 170 no doubt was entertained that the institution of episcopacy had come down from apostolic times.

Without dwelling on other second century evidence, I go back at once to the *Epistles of Ignatius*, the genuineness of which may, since the publication of Bishop Lightfoot's book, be regarded as fully established. Harnack takes the only ground on which there is now any room for contest, in suggesting that the letters may not be quite so early as has been generally thought; for that the universal Church tradition that the martyrdom had taken place in the reign of Trajan may possibly be erroneous, and the actual date have been some ten or even twenty years later. The matter is

one on which I am not concerned to contend very strenuously. Trajan died A.D. 117. If the date of the Ignatian letters could be pushed down to as late as 130, they would still be of an antiquity to which, in the remains of the early Church, we have little comparable. If I saw evidence to justify it, I should not be sorry to diminish the interval between the martyrdoms of Ignatius and Polycarp. Placing the latter at A.D. 155, if we put the former at 115 we get a duration of forty years, and possibly more, for Polycarp's episcopate. This is an unusual length, but by no means unprecedented, and we must remember that Polycarp's life was unusually long. Of the two prelates who were at the head of the Church of Ireland when I was ordained, the one, Primate Beresford, had an episcopate of fifty-seven years; the other, Archbishop Whately, only of thirty-two years indeed: but if he had lived to be as old as Polycarp was at the time of his death, it would have been one of forty-two. It is certain that Polycarp's episcopate was a very long one; for, as we know from Irenæus, the general belief in his later life was that it had gone back to the times of the Apostles. Eusebius certainly had no doubt that Ignatius suffered in the reign of Trajan, and in the absence of any evidence the other way, the mere possibility that Eusebius may have been mistaken is no sufficient ground for rejecting his authority. And certainly no small proof of the antiquity of the Ignatian letters is afforded by their silence on the questions raised by the great Gnostic teachers, whose theories made such a noise in the Church in the first half of the second century.

When the Ignatian letters came into prominence in the modern controversy between episcopacy and presbyterianism, the idea of those who rejected the letters was that they were documents forged in the interests of episcopacy, then a new institution struggling into life. I do not think that any intelligent critic will now maintain that opinion as to the object of the letters; on this point Lightfoot (*Ignatius*,

i. 377), Hatch (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 30), Harnack (*Expositor*, III. 16) are in full agreement. The object of Ignatius is not to exalt the episcopate at the expense of the presbyterate, or any other form of government, but rather to forbid the making of schisms or the holding private conventicles. It is taken for granted that episcopacy is the settled form of Church government; and the bishop is mentioned because he is the recognised head of the Church, on the duty of union with which the writer is anxious to insist. If the exaltation of the episcopate had been the writer's primary object, we should not meet the strange phenomenon that the letter to the Church of Rome makes no mention of its bishop.

I think it is not a just inference from this last fact that the episcopate was less developed at Rome than in these Asiatic Churches, with whose bishops Ignatius had come into personal contact. He himself gives us no reason to imagine that he supposed episcopacy to be a provincial peculiarity of his own part of the world. On the contrary, he assumes it to be the constitution of the Church everywhere, and speaks of "the bishops settled in the farthest parts of the world" (*οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὀρισθέντες*.—*Ep.* 3).

The explanation which I am disposed to offer of the silence of Ignatius concerning the bishop of Rome is, that in the second century the bishop was not at all so prominent a figure, when the Church was looked at from without, as when looked at from within. To illustrate what I mean, any one conversant with the House of Commons, at least as it used to be, knows what an important personage the Speaker is in the House, what respect it has been customary to pay him, and with what deference his rulings have been regarded. But outside the House the Speaker possesses no authority, and you might read long accounts of things done by the House of Commons without ever discovering from them that there was such a person. In like manner, it



appears to me that, however great the influence exercised during the second century by each bishop in his own Church, he was no autocrat, and his action had importance for the outside world only so far as it was adopted by his Church.

Lightfoot shows satisfactorily from the Ignatian letters themselves (see *Ignatius*, i., p. 282) that, according to the conception of Ignatius, the bishop was no autocrat, and was not thought of acting independently of his presbyters or of his Church. So we need not be surprised to find that though the great, rich, and powerful Church of Rome exercised much influence, yet until, through the success of the Clementine fictions, the succession from Peter came to be believed in, the question for other Churches was, not what the bishop of Rome would do, but what the Church of Rome would do. The letter of Clement, though speaking in a high tone of authority, is written, not in the name of Clement, but in that of the Church of Rome. Clement's name is not mentioned, either in the opening salutation or in the body of the letter; and it remains a problem how it came to be so generally known that Clement was the writer. The same thing is to be said about the letter of Dionysius of Corinth already mentioned. This letter is addressed to the Church of Rome, not to its bishop, though Soter is mentioned as the agent in communicating the liberality of the Roman Church. If it had not been for this, there would apparently have been no occasion for mentioning his name. To the bishop's share in administering the funds of the Church I shall return presently.

Coming down still later, to a period when, it has been thought, we have the power of the bishop of Rome full grown, I mean the attempt of Victor to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches, we find that Victor acted but as the mouthpiece of his Church; nor do I think that there is ground for the violent contrast which Lightfoot (*Philippians*,

p. 222) draws between the "mild and peaceful counsels of the presbyter-bishop Clement" and the "autocratic pretensions of the haughty pope Victor." It seems to me to admit of no doubt that the *De Pudicitia* of Tertullian, from which Lightfoot here cites a passage, is later than the episcopate of Victor, and therefore that the passage has no relevance when the question of the pretensions of Victor is under consideration. The letter of Polycrates concerning the paschal controversy is described by Eusebius as addressed to Victor and to the Church of Rome; and therefore it is reasonable to believe that Victor's name was mentioned in the opening salutation, which has not been preserved. But the extracts which Eusebius gives from the letter itself show that it was addressed, not to Victor individually, but to his Church. We have in one place, ἐγὼ οὖν, ἀδελφοί; in another place, τῶν ἐπισκόπων οὗς ὑμεῖς ἠξιώσατε μετακληθῆναι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. The plural ἠξιώσατε shows further that not only was the letter of Polycrates addressed to the Church of Rome, but that the original letter, to which this was a reply, had been written, not in Victor's own name, but in that of his Church.

We shall be unjust to Victor and his Church if we do not bear in mind what provocation they had received before resorting to such a step as excommunication. The Church of Rome had for a long time tolerated diversity as to the time and manner of paschal celebrations. Diversities in the usages of Churches at a distance from one another would cause little or no practical inconvenience. But in the time of Victor, a presbyter, Blastus (see Euseb., *H. E.* v. 15, 20; Pseudo-Tert. 22), raised a schism in Rome itself on the paschal question, asserting that it was unlawful to hold the celebration on any other day than on the day of the Jewish passover. Naturally it was felt to be intolerably inconvenient that a schismatical party at Rome should pronounce it unlawful to join in the common celebra-

tions of the Church, and should declare themselves bound by God's law to keep their paschal feast, not on the Church's day, but on the same day as the Jews. Accordingly Irenæus addressed to Blastus a letter "Concerning Schism"; but the conduct of this presbyter was suspected of being heretical as well as schismatical, and it was imagined that he aimed at imposing on the Christian Church the yoke of subjection to the Mosaic law. It was not unnatural then that the Roman Church should feel that this Judaizing practice ought now to be put down. Yet they took no hasty step, but proceeded to collect testimonies as to the practice, with respect to paschal celebrations, of the whole Christian world. The assembling of a general council was in heathen times a thing impossible; but each bishop was requested to collect the evidence of the neighbouring bishops, and send a report of their views to Rome. And it was only when the evidence thus collected established the fact that Quartodecimanism was but the local peculiarity of a small minority that steps were taken at Rome to put it down altogether by the excommunication of that minority if they refused to conform to the elsewhere prevalent usage.

I am not willing to admit that even the excommunication of a provincial Church by the Church of Rome can properly be described as an act of "autocratic pretension." Every Church is within its own rights in deciding with whom it will hold communion. If in consequence of a dispute between the courts of England and Russia the English ambassador were withdrawn from St. Petersburg, this suspension of friendly relations would not imply that the English nation claimed sovereignty of any kind over the Russian. But a suspension of friendly relations between the Church of Rome and a provincial Church was to inflict a very severe penalty on the latter. Leading men from every part of the provinces had constant occasion to visit



Rome on business. If their Church were in communion with Rome, they had but to bring letters from their own bishop, and they were at once acknowledged as Christians; and if clergymen in their own Church, were acknowledged as clergymen. If their Church were put out of communion, their bishop's letters would no longer be recognised, and the members of it on visiting Rome would find themselves in a humiliating position. But the Church of Rome desired that the action which she took should be joined in by the other Churches which agreed with her on the paschal question; and in this she failed, mainly owing to the resistance of Irenæus. It appears to me that Victor's excommunication was not then persevered in, for I find no evidence of its having been in force during the next century.

Although I have given reason for thinking that Victor only acted in the name and with the authority of his Church, yet it is proper to mention that this excommunication is spoken of by early writers as specially Victor's act; and I believe that in those days an excommunication was always regarded as the act of the bishop who solemnly pronounced it, even though he may not have acted without the concurrence of his Church. Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28) tells, from a contemporary authority, of another person excommunicated by Victor for denying our Lord's divinity, and in the same chapter of the excommunication of one Natalius by Victor's successor, Zephyrinus. In St. John's third epistle also another attempted excommunication is spoken of as the act of a single person, Diotrephes. But that the Church as well as the bishop were parties to the excommunication may be inferred, I think, from what we are told of the efforts made by the just-mentioned Natalius in order to obtain restoration; who threw himself at the feet, not only of the bishop, but of the clergy, and even the laity, imploring with tears readmission into the Church.

Before quitting this period, I have to speak of another

function which then specially belonged to the bishop, the administration of the funds bestowed by the liberality of the Church. I have already mentioned one illustration of this; namely, that the bishop Soter is specially mentioned as the agent in the bestowal of a gift by the Church of Rome on the Church of Corinth. We have a description by Justin Martyr of Christian worship in the middle of the second century. In this there is one prominent figure, a person whom Justin, writing for heathen, and all through avoiding the use of ecclesiastical terms, calls the president. To him candidates for baptism are brought; by him the weekly worship is conducted; and as part of that worship a collection of alms is made, which is brought to this president, who distributes it through the instrumentality of his deacons to those who are in need. In the Church of Rome, the richest of the Christian Churches, the office of the chief of the deacons, who, under the bishop's authority, conducted this distribution, came into great prominence. His office of searching out and examining into all cases of distress would bring him into daily intimate contact with the people, and would enable him to confer many favours, so that naturally he would be the most widely known and the best loved of Roman ecclesiastics, and therefore was most frequently chosen in due time to fill the bishop's place. Not to mention many later instances, a testimony has been already quoted that Eleutherus, the bishop in the time of Irenæus, had been deacon to the earlier Bishop Soter.

And here it is necessary to take notice of an unfortunate speculation of Dr. Hatch, that it was with special reference to his financial functions that the name bishop was given to the president of the Christian community. The idea would scarcely have occurred to him but for his adoption of a faulty method. I hold it to be wise, in exploring the dark period of Church history, to make all the use we can

of the light from both ends of the tunnel: Dr. Hatch carefully shuts out the light from both ends. That he should exclude the light from the later end is a course defensible on the ground that we are bound to be careful not to attribute to the earliest age of the Christian Church the ideas or language of a later period. But I can find no excuse for his systematic disregard of the New Testament books; that is to say, in tracing the origin of Christian institutions, his leaving out of sight the earliest and most authentic documents that speak of them. This process of shutting out the light is just what one does when one wants to exhibit fancy pictures with a magic lantern. In the present case, Dr. Hatch begins by offering proof from inscriptions that the name *ἐπίσκοπος* was given to the financial administrators of heathen associations. The proof offered is extremely meagre; and proof that the general word, meaning overseer, was limited to this special meaning is scarcely offered at all. But suppose we accept it as fully satisfactory, this is no explanation of the much earlier use of the word in Christian communities. We might nearly as well argue that because in England the name overseer has been given to parish officers charged with the relief of the poor, therefore it was with special reference to the relief of the poor the name "overseer" was given by Christians to the head of their society. The word is found in the Septuagint, and for the Christian use of the word the New Testament is the primary authority. It seems to me to admit of no doubt that in the New Testament use of the word the oversight contemplated is not financial but spiritual. One example might suffice. Dr. Hatch has so firmly convinced himself that the word *ἐπίσκοπος* denotes primarily a financial administrator, that he calls (p. 41) it a startling metaphor that God should be called by Ignatius the overseer of all (*πατέρα τῶν ὁλῶν καὶ ἐπίσκοπον*). If he had looked into the New Testament, I cannot conceive

how he could have found finance in St. Peter's description (1 Pet. ii. 25) of our Lord as the "Shepherd and Bishop of our souls." Or again read St. Paul's solemn charge (Acts xx. 28), "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood," and imagine that it means no more than a direction to the overseer to look sharp after the finances of the little community. Want of sympathy with the subjects of his story is the gravest fault of which a historian can be guilty; and it seems to me that Dr. Hatch has turned his thoughts so exclusively to the secular side of the Christian associations as not to perceive how very subordinate was this aspect of them in the minds of the Christians themselves. It was the hopes and fears of another life which led to the formation of the Christian societies. Living in this world, these societies could not help attending to the bodily wants of their poorer members, but what drew the societies together was concern, not for their bodies, but their souls; and their officers were honoured not for their skill in finance, but because they "watched for their souls as men that must give an account."<sup>1</sup>

The result of the method hitherto pursued, namely, that of beginning with the end of the second century and tracing the history backwards, is that we get back to the time of Ignatius, that is to say, to the latter part of the first quarter of the second century, without finding any indication that the organization of the Christian ministry was different then from what we find it in the time of Irenæus. But

<sup>1</sup> It seems to me that Dr. Hatch lays undue stress on the use of the Latin word *regere* in connexion with the office of presbyter, through not having observed that in the old Latin version *regere* is the ordinary rendering of the Greek *ποιμαίνειν*, a word for which it is hard to find a single equivalent in another language. The "feed" of our Authorized Version takes notice only of the shepherd's office in feeding the flock, the Latin *regere* only of his duty in guiding and directing them.

the aspect of things is somewhat different if we begin our investigations at the other end. The authorities we then have to use are, in addition to the books of the New Testament, the epistles of Clement and Barnabas, the lately recovered *Teaching of the Apostles*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. In counting this last among our more ancient authorities, I adopt an opinion from which several living scholars of eminence dissent. If I could be sure that their adoption of a current opinion was the result of serious independent investigation of their own, I should not venture to say at all, what I now only say with fear and trembling, though it is my honest belief; namely, that to assign a late date to Hermas is incompatible with understanding the history of the progress of Christian thought and of Church organization during the second century.

What I have here to speak of is the prophetic office as it appears in Hermas. In Justin Martyr's account of Christian worship, he makes no mention of exhortations addressed to the assembly by any one but the president. Ignatius frequently speaks of "the prophets," and he always means the Old Testament prophets, and gives no indication that there is any ambiguity in the term, or that it was then used to denote an order of men in the Christian Church. In Hermas, on the contrary, we find the prophetic office in full vigour. We learn (*Mandat.* xii.) that in the public assembly for worship, after prayer made, the angel of the prophetic spirit would fill the prophet, who would then speak unto the people as the Lord willed. Hermas finds the necessity of distinguishing between the true prophet and sham prophets. The former was meek, lowly, and unworldly, and would only deliver his prophecies in public in the manner just described: the latter were self-seeking, ambitious of precedence, luxurious in their life, would act as soothsayers in private, answering questions put to them and taking money for it, but were dumb in the



public assembly. From this point alone it is evident that Hermas, who evidently was himself a prophet, belongs to an earlier period of ecclesiastical organization than Ignatius.<sup>1</sup> In the Pauline epistles (1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. iv. 11) we read of prophets and teachers as bearing office in the Church, the former word no doubt denoting men endowed with supernatural gifts of the Holy Ghost, the latter denoting uninspired teachers. We find from 1 Corinthians xiv. that those endowed with prophetic gifts were allowed to address the assembly in turn, and therefore we have reason to think that in the first age of the Church the right of publicly addressing the assembly was not the exclusive privilege of the presbyters. We cannot say how long miraculous gifts continued in the Church; but though the *Teaching of the Apostles* and Hermas both indicate that addresses in the assembly were, when these books were written, still given by those who were recognised as prophets, it is also evident from both writings that the Church was then embarrassed by the difficulty of distinguishing true prophets from false pretenders; and though Hermas himself was apparently recognised as a prophet in the Church of his day, his claims to inspiration were, after about a century, generally rejected.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It may of course be said that in Rome, where Hermas wrote, Church organization had developed itself more slowly than in Syria. And we might believe this, if there were any good evidence for the late date of Hermas. But for the early date there is the testimony of Hermas himself, who claims to have been a contemporary of Clement, that is to say, to have lived at the end of the first century and the very beginning of the second; for the late date there is only the testimony of an anonymous person, of whose means of information we have no guarantee, who probably had good authority for saying that Bishop Pius of Rome had a brother named Hermas, but none for saying that it was this Hermas who wrote the *Shepherd*.

<sup>2</sup> The *Didaché* contains a prohibition against trying or proving a prophet speaking in a spirit. Every sin shall be forgiven, but not that sin. Yet it goes on to tell how, by his manner of life, the false prophet can be discerned from the true. I consider that this is explained by what took place in the Montanist controversy, when the bishops, persuaded that the Montanist prophetesses were possessed by an evil spirit, attempted to exorcise them, an attempt which naturally was indignantly repelled by the Montanists. This testing by exorcism, if applied to one really inspired by the Spirit of God, involved the risk of

When speaking of prophetic gifts I must say something about Montanism, concerning which I consider that two mistakes are sometimes made. The first is to regard it a survival of the primitive constitution of the Church; whereas I believe it to be, not a survival, but an unsuccessful local attempt at revival. Montanism is not earlier than the last quarter of the second century; but by the end of the first quarter the gift of prophecy, though not supposed to be completely withdrawn from the Church, had ceased to be an ordinary feature of Church life, and the attempt to revive it in Phrygia was discredited by the frantic behaviour of the so-called prophets.

But it is a more important mistake to treat it as a thing to be regretted that the Church rulers refused to obey the commands given in these utterances supposed to be in-

incurring the penalties denounced by our Lord (in words to which the *Didaché* plainly refers) against the sin against the Holy Ghost. That this prohibition was not produced in the Montanist controversy gives us a right to think that the *Didaché* had a very limited circulation. A further proof is that Apollonius, writing against the Montanists (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18), treats it as a thing forbidden by Scripture, and manifestly indefensible, that a prophet should receive money or presents. But the reception of such gifts is expressly sanctioned in the *Didaché*.

It may now be considered as certain that the *Didaché*, as published by Bryennius, is not the earliest form of the document. Prof. Warfield rightly called attention to the importance of the extant fragment of the Latin translation, which, though it carries us but a little way, proves that a great part of Bryennius's first chapter, containing large extracts from the Sermon on the Mount, is a later addition. The conclusions drawn from the Latin fragment are amply confirmed by Lactantius and other authorities, who use the *Didaché* in its original form. In my opinion, the interpolated section is clearly later than Hermas. Evidently he who interpolated this section may also have interpolated others, so that any conclusions are precarious that we may arrive at as to the original form of certain portions of the *Didaché*. What has been said above may give rise to a suspicion that the interpolations were made in Montanist interests; but if this had been so, I think we should have had some reference in the *Didaché* to the question whether one under the influence of the Holy Spirit retained his self-possession. My own view is, that the original was a Jewish manual used in the instruction of proselytes, and which with certain modifications continued to be used for the same purpose in the Jewish Christian Church, but which had very limited circulation or influence in Gentile Churches.

spired ; that, for example, when the prophetesses proclaimed themselves authorized to institute new annual fasts, they treated the new institutions as of no authority ; that they regarded the question whether a person who had been excommunicated ought or ought not to be restored as one to be settled by the calm deliberation of the Church rulers, and not by what a prophetess might declare herself inspired to pronounce for or against his readmission. If the Church had taken a different line, its doctrine and discipline, instead of being guided by calm and thoughtful men, would have been left at the mercy of excitable women. It is true that the Montanist prophetesses uttered nothing repugnant to the orthodoxy in which they had been brought up ; but what guarantee could there be for the soundness of doctrine if left to be developed by such hands ? It seems to me that the ancient Church, which rejected the Montanist pretensions, was far wiser than the modern Church of Rome, which has yielded to them ; as when, for example, she instituted the feast of Corpus Christi in obedience to the inspired direction of one prophetess, or sanctioned the devotion to the sacred heart of Jesus in compliance with another.

I return now to the question of gradations of rank in the ministry, which, as I already said, presents a different aspect when looked at from opposite ends of the dimly lighted period. The distinction between bishop and presbyter, which remains so marked as we go back from Irenæus to Ignatius, seems to disappear when we consult the earlier authorities. In the Acts we read of the apostolic missionaries appointing in each Church presbyters, not a bishop and presbyters. In the same book (xx. 17, 28) the same persons are called both *presbyteri* and *episcopi* ; only two orders in the ministry, bishops and deacons, are recognised in St. Paul's later epistles (Phil. i. 1 ; 1 Tim. iii.). The same two orders only are mentioned in Clement's epistle and in the *Didaché*. Hermas, though he makes special



mention of Clement, who, according to early tradition, was bishop, and certainly was a prominent member, of the Church of Rome, yet speaks of the government of that Church as in the hands of "the presbyters" (*Vis.* ii. 4). He twice speaks of bishops, who may or may not be the same as those whom he has called presbyters. On the other hand, it is to be said that it does not appear from the New Testament that the presbyters were at any time the supreme authority in the Church. During the lifetime of the Apostles, the rulers of each Church were of course subject to them. We do not find that the Christian ministry was developed by a process of spontaneous generation; that is to say, not through the process of each Church looking out its best and fittest men, and placing them in office. We find from the Acts that the presbyters were appointed not by each Church, but by the apostolic missionaries who founded it. Even when the apostolic generation was passing away, we find from St. Paul's pastoral epistles two men of the second generation, Timothy and Titus, exercising similar authority both in the original appointment of presbyters and in the adjudication of charges brought against them.

There is one case in which the New Testament completely harmonizes with second century opinion; namely, with regard to the position held by James in the Church of Jerusalem. Several passages (*e.g.* Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18; Gal. ii. 12) agree with the tradition that James was at the head of that Church; but he exercises no despotic authority. It is to "the elders" that Paul and Barnabas bring the gifts of the Church of Antioch (Acts xi. 30); the decision (Acts xv.) as to the obligation of Gentiles to observe the Mosaic law is taken after conference with the elders, and with their approbation. So likewise the elders are assembled to receive Paul and Barnabas on their later visit to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 18). I have already compared the authority exercised by the bishop and the early

Church to that exercised by the Speaker of the House of Commons; but a closer parallel would be that exercised by the chairman of a railway company, who combines the functions of speaker and leader of the house; that is to say, who not only presides at the meetings of the company, but takes a foremost part in the debate, proposing to the meeting the resolutions which are usually adopted on his recommendation, though until so adopted they have no authority. The case of Pericles at Athens, not to quote instances from modern statesmen, shows what really despotic authority can be enjoyed by the first citizen of a free country.

A few words may be said as to the cases of Timothy and Titus. It is clear that Timothy was not a mere delegate of Paul, but that he held an office which had been conferred on him in the face of the Church by solemn ordination (1 Tim. iv. 14). But what was the office? It must have been higher than that of the presbyters, over whom Timothy exercised authority. Was it not then that of bishop, as the ancients held, who inferred that Timothy was first bishop of Ephesus, Titus of Crete? We are here in the region of conjecture, and since no one is entitled to make a positive affirmation, I shall venture to add my guess. In the list of Church officers (Eph. iv. 11), after the inspired "apostles and prophets," and before the ordinary "pastors and teachers," we read of an office not mentioned in the Epistle to the Corinthians, evangelists. The only other places in the New Testament where the name occurs is that Philip is called the evangelist (Acts xxi. 8), and that Timothy is exhorted to do the work of an evangelist (2 Tim. iv. 5). My guess is that "evangelist" was an office created in the later apostolic Church, when with the growth of the Church the Apostles no longer sufficed for its missionary needs, and that the work of an evangelist included the planting new Churches, the appointing their ministers, and the exercising apostolic authority over them. Such, I imagine, may have

been the office held by Timothy, one not continued in the settled constitution ultimately established in the Church.

Before leaving the epistles to Timothy, I will add a few words about Linus, whom the earliest tradition recognises as first bishop of Rome. His name is mentioned in the salutations at the end of Paul's epistle (2 Tim. iv. 21), but not in a prominent place: "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren." We may regard this as a strong presumption in favour of the antiquity of the epistles to Timothy; but if Paul had appointed him bishop, we should have expected him to have put his name in the first place. Here again we are reduced to conjecture; but then it is natural to think, that the presbyters who had been directly appointed by Apostles would always enjoy pre-eminent authority in the Church. If one of them outlived the rest, and if his character were such as to inspire high respect, he might almost be dictator to the Church. This may have been the case with Linus: he may have been appointed by Paul; he may have exercised episcopal authority in the Church of Rome, and yet not been appointed by Paul as its bishop, but only allowed the sole authority when no other person had credentials such as his. We are here in the region of conjecture. The tendency of the age was to desire to have authority concentrated in the hands of a single ruler. As far as the evidence goes, no sooner had a Church been deprived of the rule of the apostolic missionaries who had founded it, than one of its own members took the leading part in its guidance. It was the universal belief of the second century that the transition from the temporary to the permanent form of Church government was made by apostolic authority. The transition was so early, and the life ascribed to the Apostle John is so long, that it is highly credible that at least that Apostle had a share in this transition. But direct evidence on the subject is wanting.

GEORGE SALMON.

## THE IDOLATRY OF CIVILIZED MEN.<sup>1</sup>

“While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen.”—2 Cor. iv. 18.

THIS contrast, in what we have to do with here, fills, so to speak, the atmosphere of Ascension Day. All day long the voice pursues us, “Lift up your hearts”; “He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all heavens,” ascended “that He might fill all things”; “Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth”; “Your life is hid with Christ in God”; “The things that are seen are for the time, the things that are not seen are eternal.”

This great contrast is part of the necessary condition of our human being, if there is any religious truth in the world. The things that are seen, that are now, are indeed of the deepest interest, most precious and most eventful, of far reaching, incalculable influence. Duty, and faith, and love, and goodness, and justice, and mercy have to do with the things that are now, the things that are seen: who can measure their greatness, their value? But when all *that* has been said, realized most amply, felt most keenly, still it remains true that man was made for a life, for a sphere, even greater than the greatest we can know here; that “all that is seen is but for a time; that the things that are not seen are eternal.”

And Christ our Master went up on high out of our sight to draw our hearts after Him, to make us feel that, in spite of all veils and shadows now, in spite of all interests and all duties now, the end and goal for which we live and think and will is beyond all that we can ever know here—to make us *feel* it, to make us *imagine* it. *Know* indeed we do, and we bless His name for what He has shown us:

<sup>1</sup> Delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral on Ascension Day, May 19th, 1887.

but we know, we *can* know, only in part ; we know as those who are encompassed by inscrutable, unfathomable nature, and between whom and the unseen stands the curtain of death—death, silent, final, without answer. We know as those who have known the mystery of the Incarnation, and have seen the dawn of Easter, and who “look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come” : and yet that is little to what we *shall* know when “we know even as we are known.” But this at least is part of our knowledge, that what we are here is but a little fragment of what we were made for ; and that Christ is gone up to the throne of God to warrant us in going up there too, in heart and mind continually, in hope, in rejoicing, in wonder, in adoration ; in the persuasion that though He is *there*, He is yet also here, always with us, even to the end of the world.

And to Him we owe our supreme loyalty and duty and devotion and boundless trust as to our Lord and our God. The love of Him, the union in affection and will with Him—that is what we profess, that, when it is in reality and truth, is Christian religion. The world is full of other religions : I do not mean here of other professions and forms of religion, the varieties of belief and worship and religious custom which divide the world, Christian and non-Christian. I mean religion in the sense of what a man’s heart owns to as most mighty and most irresistible in all things round him ; what he bows down to and sincerely worships in the secret sanctuary of desire and will ; what he holds highest and most precious, most excellent and most Divine in what he knows and thinks of, most worthy his homage, his labour, his interest, the spending his life for. That is truly a man’s religion the object of which fills and holds captive his soul and heart and mind, in which he trusts above all things, which imposes on him reverence and awe, which above all things he longs for and hopes for. It is that



which possesses and fascinates all that is most real in the man's self, that which in his real self he is devoted to, of all things within his range and all the things among which he may choose. "Covetousness," says the apostle, "which is idolatry,"—worship of an idol, which stands between the soul and God, making itself the soul's real god, appropriating all faculties and all movements of thought and will which belong to God. Such religions there are among us, active, energetic, consistent religions, which place something before the soul which is short of our Lord and God, and which in their sincerity and reality put to shame the dulness of Christian faith, and the slackness of Christian devotion. Their objects are things in the world: some of them bad and hateful; some of them the gifts, the creations of God Himself, but which are made to take His place, and are thought of and prized and extolled as if He was not. We sometimes wonder what to us instructed, reasonable Christians, who cannot conceive ourselves, even in imagination, bowing down to a graven image, what can be any longer the meaning and lesson of the Second Commandment, "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." What is the use of repeating it? Can we even imagine the temptation to do so? But are there no other things, the idols of refined and civilized men, no other "likenesses" than were known in old time, "of things that are in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth," to which worship is done, subtle, profound, and absorbing,—idols which occupy the place of God, or perhaps profess to represent Him,—idols which meet us at every turn, and which need and justify the reiterated command, "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them."

For instance, God is all-powerful, almighty, and we worship Him who is the Maker and Ruler of all things. But the world, as we know it and have to do with it, is

full of forces and necessities, whose origin and law is lost in darkness, which we cannot trace beyond a little way back, which seem self-originated and self-acting.<sup>1</sup> They

<sup>1</sup> Am Meer, am wüsten, nächtlichen Meer

Steht ein Jungling-Mann,  
Die Brust voll Wehmuth, das Haupt  
voll Zweifel,

Und mit düstern Lippen fragt er die  
Wogen.

O lös't mir das Rathsel des Lebens,  
Das qualvoll uralte Rathsel. . . .

Sagt mir, was bedeutet der Mensch ?  
Woher ist er kommen ? Wo geht er  
hin ?

Wer wohnt dort oben auf goldenen  
Sternen ?

Es murmeln die Wogen ihr ewiges  
Gemurmel,

Es wehet der Wind, es fliehen die  
Wolken,

Es blinken die Sterne, gleichgültig und  
kalt,

Und ein Narr wartet auf Antwort.

Heine: *Die Nord-see.*

How summer bright are yonder skies,  
And earth as fair in hue ;

And yet what sign of aught that lies  
Behind the green and blue ?

For man to-day is Fancy's fool,

As man hath ever been ;

The nameless Power, or Powers, that  
rule

Were never heard or seen.

The years that made the stripling wise,  
Undo their work again ;

And leave him, blind of heart and eyes,  
The last and least of men.

But vain the tears for darkened years,  
As laughter over wine,

And vain the laughter as the tears,  
O brother, mine or thine.

For all that laugh, and all that weep,  
And all that breathe are one

Slight ripple on the boundless deep  
That moves, and all is gone.

"The Song," in Tennyson's  
*Ancient Sage.*

Pur tu, solinga, eterna peregrina,  
Che sì pensosa sei, Tu forse intendi,

Questo viver terreno :

Il patir nostro, il sospirar, che sia ;

Che sia questo morir, questo supremo

Scolorar del sembiante,

E perir dalla terra, e venir meno

Ad ogni usata, amante compagnia.

E tu certo comprendi

Il perchè delle cose, e vedi il frutto,

Del mattin, della sera,

Del tacito, infinito andar del tempo.

A che tante facelle ?

Che fa l'aria infinita e quel profondo

Infinito seren ? che vuol dir questo

Solitudine immensa ? ed io che sono.

Leopardi, *Canto d' un pastore  
dell' Asia alla Luna.*

"Ma da natura

Altro negli atti suoi

Che nostro male onostro ben si cura."

"Misterio eterno

Dell'esser nostro ! oggi d'eccelsi, im-  
mensi

Pensieri e sensi inenarrabil fonte,

Beltà grandeggia, e pare,

Quale splendor vibrato

Da natura immortal su queste arene,

Di sovrumani fati,

Di fortunati regni e d' aurei mondi

Segno e sicura speme



are awful, tremendous, irresistible, irreversible. They seem blind and aimless. We are powerless in their grasp if we oppose them; if we can use and direct them, it is still as blind and deaf and unchangeable and senseless forces. They bind us fast in their chain; they cut across the field of human will and feeling and purpose, reckless of the havoc they make, of the hopes they disappoint. In the onward roll and tide of what seems a boundless ocean, comprehending all things, from the hypothetic atom or the microscopic cell and germ to the farthest sun, the moral world, as we know it, seems swamped and lost. They care neither for good nor bad. They bind us with bonds which oppress and crush us.<sup>1</sup> This tremendous side of nature is

Dare al mortale stato.	E dalle mente insieme
Diman, per lieve forza,	Quel che da lui moveva
Sozzo a vedere, abominoso, abbietto,	Ammirabil concetto, si diletta.
Divien quel che fu dianzi	Leopardi, <i>Canti</i> (Firenze,
Quasi angelico aspetto,	1876, pp. 155, 158).

#### 1 TO NATURE

(*In her ascribed character of unmeaning and all-performing force*).

O Nature! thou whom I have thought to love,  
 Seeing in thee the reflex of God's face,  
 A loathed abstraction would usurp thy place,—  
 While Him they not dethrone, they but disprove.  
 Weird Nature! can it be that joy is fled,  
 And bald unmeaning lurks beneath thy smile,  
 That beauty haunts the dust but to beguile,  
 And that with Order, Love and Hope are dead?

Pitiless Force, all-moving, all-unmoved,  
 Dread mother of unfathered worlds, assuage  
 Thy wrath on us,—be this wild life reprov'd,  
 And trampled into nothing in thy rage!

Vain prayer, although the last of human kind—  
 Force is not wrath, but only deaf and blind.

*Sonnets by Emily Pfeiffer* (p. 29).

On which the late Mr. Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln, wrote to the authoress (*ib.*, p. iii.): "I think the most striking and original of your sonnets are those which are inspired by the evolutionary idea—an idea or form of universal apprehension, which, like a boa, has enfolded all mind in this generation in its inexorable coil. Try as we may, we cannot extricate our thought from

an idea which enlarging knowledge has brought home to our generation with a sharpness and definiteness never recognised before. It fills and occupies minds, till even the consciousness of will becomes overshadowed and cast into the background, a phenomenon, or a doubt. And with this dread image before men's minds there grows up a terrible religion of despair, a religion which men accept and believe in and assert. Nature in its garb of fate and necessity has shut out God; and men with hearts and consciences and affections bow their heads before it, and resign themselves, sometimes with a light heart, sometimes with piercing agonies which they cannot suppress, to a world in which they can see nothing but pitiless *fact*.

Again, it may be said that there is a religion of literature. Literature, the record and image of the thoughts, impressions, and feelings of men, in the most diversified conditions and in the most diversified expression, is one of the gifts which have been made to our time: a gift, a real and inestimable gift it is; a strange and new one, distributing without stint to the many what used to be the prerogative and treasure of the few; opening more and more the inexhaustible wonders of the intellect and the character of man;

this serpent's fold. Its pressure upon the soul forces our spirit to cry out with a Laocoon shriek; but though the inspiration of despair, it is inspiration, and poetry is its natural vent. You seem to give it vent with great power. Perhaps I could have wished for a more profound agony in the feeling at times, But the calm contemplation of our fate as helpless victims is perhaps the most just mental attitude. I select especially the three first sonnets to 'Nature,' which seem to me noble and powerful expressions of the sentiment. . . . The last line in the second sonnet \* is wonderful, and still haunts my memory—

'And darkly blundered on man's suffering soul.' "

- \* "Thou art not calm, but restless as the ocean,  
 Filling with aimless toil the endless years—  
 Stumbling on thought, and throwing off the spheres,  
 Churning the universe into mindless motion.  
 Dull fount of joy, unhallowed source of tears,  
 Cold motor of our fervid faith and song,  
 Dead, but engendering life, love, pangs, and fears,  
 Thou crownedst thy wild work with foulest wrong,  
 When first thou lightedst on a seeming goal,  
 And darkly blundered on man's suffering soul."

placing within increasing range access to all that is loftiest and wisest, most perfect and noblest in what men now and before us have thought and said; leaving us utterly without excuse if, with the very highest placed within our reach, we choose the refuse and the vile. But it is a dazzling gift, a gift which makes men think that there can be nothing to match it, nothing beyond it. To know what great minds have spoken; to feel elevated by being in their presence and in sympathy with them; to put our footsteps into their tracks of thought; to see true and deep things said in the most perfect and most living words; to feel the mind awakening, expanding, glowing, gathering light and enthusiasm and strength from contact with the power and insight of minds greater than itself; to understand the opening of the eyes and the unlocking of the heart and its dim secrets as new ideas rise above the horizon and open before them; and still more, not merely to receive, but to *create*, not merely to be a listener and disciple, but to be conscious of being a master and a teacher;—this carries with it a charm which, as we know, has often been able to make other pursuits seem tame and other glories pale. It seems so pure and noble; it seems so full of good; it seems so to exalt and refine; and under its influence nothing else seems equally capable of exalting and refining, nothing else seems to bring with it good, *so* to inspire and fortify, *so* to calm and sober and enlighten. Why should men look beyond it? Where would they be likely to find deeper and more abundant and more various truth? Where would they find truth expressed in more adequate, in less limited or less repellent forms? Where will they learn to think in more dignified or consoling fashion of even the hard portions of our lot, pain and disease and death? Is not this enough for the heart and soul of man, of man at least, cultivated, civilized, instructed, enlightened? Is it not enough for his meditations, his aspirations, his secret acts of devout

homage, and devout uplifting of the spirit? Will not the religion of great books and great thinkers, the religion of genius and poetic truth, be a sufficient religion?

Once more. There is a mysterious power in the world, a mysterious endowment given to man, one of the most wonderful and lofty of all his prerogatives—the sense of beauty. The world, we know, is full of things which, when they address themselves to eye or ear, or, without the intervention of eye or ear, to the inward mind and soul, produce on us the effect which we speak of as *beautiful*. Endlessly various, in form and light and colour, in feature and expression, in voice and tone and ordered sound, in word and suggestion, and in all that is called into invisible existence by the powers of feeling and imagination and thought, it comes before the human soul as one of the chief sources of its brightness and joy, one of the chief things which exalt and gladden life, the spring within us which never dries up of admiration, delight, rapture. Where does it come from, this strange, irresistible sense of what is beautiful; so different according to our measure with all of us, yet with all of us confessed to be so certain and so clear,—this perception, which seems to be the crown and glory of the gifts which set man at the head of all that lives: where does it come from? and what is it? Who can define or analyse it, in its infinite shapes, which agree in nothing else but that we call them all—sunrise and sunset, storm and peace, mountain and river, picture, and sculpture, and music, and building, and poem, visible features and invisible character,—all we agree to call *beautiful*? Is it anything *real*, this thing that we call beauty? or is it a mere spell cast over us, a glamour, a delusion of eye and brain, imposing on us a show without substance? It is something which appeals to us, in what is highest and purest and noblest in us; again, may be, it is something which captivates and fascinates what is meanest and lowest in our nature: yet still

we speak of it as *beauty*. Is it indeed surprising that a faculty and endowment so subtle, so charged with varied and mighty power, so full of ministry to the joy and happiness of life, should so fill human souls with its treasures and wealth as to shut out all other interests, and become to them all in all, the standard by which everything is measured, the supreme longing and rule of their lives? Is it surprising that art should almost become a religion—a worship and an enthusiasm in which the wondrous shadows of God's glory take the place of God Himself, in His holiness, His righteousness, His awful love? It is not surprising; but alas for us, if we yield to the temptation! The love of beauty, in work, and speech, and person, was the master-passion of the reviving intelligence of Italy: it attracted, it dominated all who wrote, all who sang, all who painted and moulded form. Out of it arose, austere and magnificent indeed, yet alive with all instincts of beauty, the *Divina Commedia*, the mighty thought of Lionardo and Michelangelo, the pathetic devotion and deep peace of the Lombard, Tuscan, Umbrian schools; but to whole generations of that wonderful people—from the fresh sonnet-writers and story-tellers of the closing middle age, Guido Cavalcanti and Boccaccio, to the completed refinement of the days of the great Venetian masters and Ariosto—the worship of the beautiful, as the noblest, worthiest devotion, stood in the place of truth, of morality, of goodness, of Christian life. And this idolatry of beauty brought its own punishment, the degeneracy and deep degradation both of art and character.

Yes; the world in which we now pass our days is full of great powers. Nature is great in its bounty, in its sternness, in its unbroken uniformity; literature, art, are great in what they have created for us; beauty is great in its infinite expressions: but these are not the powers for man—man, the responsible, man, the sinner and the penitent,



who may be the saint—to fall down and worship. They are to pass with the world in which we have known them, the world of which they are part; but man *remains*, remains what he is in soul and character and affections. *They* at least feel this who are drawing near to the unseen and unknown *beyond*; they to whom, it may be, these great gifts of God, the spell and wonder of art and of literature, the glory and sweet tenderness of nature, have been the brightness and joy of days that are now fast ending—*they* feel that there is *yet* an utter want of what these things cannot give: that soul and heart want something yet deeper, something more lovely, something more Divine, that which will realize man's ideals, that which will complete and fulfil his incompleteness and his helplessness—yes; the real likeness in thought and will and character to the goodness of Jesus Christ. “My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever.” Man has that *within* him which tells him in presage and parable of greater and more awful things than anything he can admire and delight in yet: he has that *without* him which certifies him that his hopes and aspirations are justified; that when these precious things of the present must pass with the world to which they belong there is laid up for him what “eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, what God hath prepared for them that love Him,”—sinlessness, strength, peace, the vision of God. Cannot we indeed, believers though we are, sympathise with the doubting poet, who realizing his thought, and comparing what is now with such hopes, was overwhelmed by it: “*Are not these things too good to be true?*”<sup>1</sup> Yes, indeed, if any one else had told us except

<sup>1</sup> Robert Burns. “One thing frightens me much—that we are to live for ever seems too good news to be true” (Currie's *Life of Burns*, vol. ii. p. 306). Compare Browning's *Easter Eve*:

“Remembering any moment who  
Besides creating thee unto



Him "who loved us and gave Himself for us," "who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man," "who died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and the living." "Too good to be true" for mere guesses and hopes; not too good to be true for those for whom God withheld not His only Son; not too good to be true, in all its unimaginable wonder, if the Conqueror of death has been here "to seek and to save that which was lost." "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not, with Him, freely give us all things?"

R. W. CHURCH.

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD  
TESTAMENT.*

*THE BOOK OF PSALMS.—II.*

MUCH has been said both for and against the marginal renderings of the Revised Version. Those who are familiar with the "poetical books" will beyond doubt agree that the margins are almost always justifiable, and often at least equal in value to the textual renderings. Would that they were more in number! There is a prismatic radiance in Hebrew poetry, and it is often next to impossible to determine with certitude between different forms of a "single

These ends, and these for thee, was said  
To undergo death in thy stead  
In flesh like thine: so ran the tale.  
What doubt in thee could countervail  
Belief in it? Upon the ground  
'That in the story had been found  
'Too much love! How could God love so?'

vague idea, or interpretations of some group of words, the key to which is to be derived from the context. "Dante," said the great modern linguist Ticknor, "is a *mare magnum* of adventure, and every time I read him, I make, or think I make, new discoveries." This will often be the experience of the constant reader of the Hebrew Psalms; and when such "discoveries" commend themselves to others, it is only reasonable that an honourable place in the margin of a translation should be accorded them. The purely English reader is only too apt to suppose that a flowing translation indicates a clear original. Now a popular translation certainly ought to flow along with some ease; otherwise, instead of meaning too much, it will certainly to the common ear and eye mean too little. But the reader ought to be warned that the waters which seem so clear, are deep, and that the meaning of the text is not to be limited to that which can most easily be expressed in English. It is a trial no doubt to have to interweave text and margin, but the sacred poets count upon willingness to take trouble in their readers. It is toilsome enough to follow them in their original language. As Delitzsch remarks, the Oriental style reckons upon an equal intellectual acuteness in the reader or hearer (note on Ps. lxxii. 15).

Let us turn now to Ps. cxxxix. There are eight margins to this psalm in A.V.; eleven in R.V., of which only two are retained from A.V. The first is on *v.* 3, where זָרִית, rendered "(Thou hast) searched out" in the text, is given more literally in the margin as "winnowest." A.V. also gives this margin, but in such a way as to indicate that it is not intended as a more literal but as an alternative rendering. Possibly therefore the old revisers would have admitted it into the text; at any rate, R.V.'s "searched out" (=scrutinized) is not sufficiently different from the "searched" of *v.* 1 to be a quite satisfactory substitute. Segond's French version (his book is doubtless familiar to

my readers<sup>1</sup>) is here the worst that I have seen. Curiously enough, it agrees with the Peshitto, which here is certainly too "simple." Kamphausen's is bold, but it satisfies my own feeling: "Ich gehe oder liege, so durchschauest du es." The image is changed, but the sense not weakened. Purvey's "Thou hast enquerid" (It. *investigasti*) might have suggested a slight improvement on "searched out." The next margin is on *v.* 11; it is necessary to make a fine passage enjoyable. The text of R.V. runs: "Surely the darkness shall overwhelm me"—an infelicitous attempt to make the best of an impossible reading. The margin, "cover," is on no philological grounds justifiable as a rendering of *שׁוֹפֵנִי*, but as the equivalent of *שׁוֹפֵנִי* or *יְעִיפֵנִי*, is justified by the verdict of many of the best scholars. This however brings us close up to the important question, Are conjectural emendations<sup>2</sup> admissible in a popular version? That they are so, at any rate in the margin, may be confidently urged in the interests of the sacred writers themselves. "Surely the darkness shall overwhelm me" is enough to condemn the rigid rules by which the Revisers were bound.

"Formed" and "knit me together" (marg. on *v.* 13) are pure gains. Such a collocation of words as, "For thou hast possessed my reins," is very unilluminative and insignificant as the introduction to the second half of the poem, and the simple comparison of that exquisite passage, Job x. 11 (R.V.), will justify to head and heart the description of God as the great artist of the body in the second margin. Whether the next alternative rendering will at once be found equally illuminative is doubtful, but a little study of

<sup>1</sup> I refer to Segond rather than to Reuss, because it has more distinctly the note of popularity. It has been printed in a beautiful and wonderfully cheap form at the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> I assume that the *ἐπισκεπάσει* of Symmachus is but the equivalent of a conjectural emendation. It is clear that this translator had a sense of literature, and it was this sense which forced him to correct the received text.

the context will justify it. It surely must be confessed that the third and fourth lines of *v.* 16 in the text are not very forcible, and as for the second line, what right has a translator to supply "my members"? The sum of the matter is that the marginal rendering of the second and third lines gives a noble expression to the idea of the providential ordering of the course of time—an idea which we should be sorry to miss in this deeply spiritual psalm. It must be granted that the first and fourth lines do not fit in very well with the second and third. The best way to produce a connexion is perhaps that suggested by Hitzig and adopted in an improved form by Delitzsch. "In God's book a day was 'formed' (comp. Isa. xxii. 11) for every event in human history, and one of these pre-existent days was set apart for the final perfecting and birth of the once unperfect substance" (reading לִי, the Q'ri, instead of לָא, the K'thib). That even the best way is bad enough, I fully admit, but I am convinced, with Bickell, that there is both confusion and to a slight extent corruption in the text of *vv.* 15, 16. Some may accuse this conviction of "subjectivity." The word is often used in a bad sense; but a subjectivity which forms and disciplines and tests itself by critical methods and canons is nothing to be ashamed of. How many of our most respected traditions are ultimately based on the very questionable "subjectivity" of early students and copyists and translators!

I have no space to comment on the rendering of the last line of *v.* 16 in the Peshitto. In *v.* 19 R.V.'s marginal rendering is probably correct (comp. xcv. 7, R.V.), but it suggests emending סורי into יסורי in company with the Peshitto and the Targum. "Utter thy name" in the next margin is not much more defensible than the textual rendering, but there is one great point in its favour that it enables us to justify the supplementary "thy name" in the second line of *v.* 20. Why it should be relegated to the

margin, I cannot say. The fact is that one word of the text in both lines of *v. 20* needs to be read differently. The true pronunciation of the textual reading *יַמְרֹד* is *yamrūka*, rendered in R.V. marg. "rebel against thee"; this agrees with the versions of Theodotion, Origen's Quinta, and the recension of the Septuagint text represented by the Syro-Hexapla version.<sup>1</sup> For the margin on *v. 20 b* it can only be said that it emphasizes the probability of a corruption in the text. If it is difficult to believe that "utter thee" can be used for "utter thy name," in *v. 20 a*, it is still more difficult to satisfy oneself that "take in vain" can be used by a kind of double ellipsis for "take thy name in vain." The margin on *v. 21 b* follows the precedent set at *cxix. 158*. We have not in English as sonorous a word for "loathed" as *אַתְּקוֹטֵט*. "Grief," *v. 24* marg. A.V. and R.V., is a strikingly preferable alternative to the feeble paraphrase in the text.

It was a great opportunity missed when the revision of the Psalter was sent out with so few margins. But those which there are, deserve, as I have said, the most attentive study. How fine, for instance, is the literal rendering of a phrase in *lxii. 1 a*, "is silent unto God"! Why was not the whole line reconstructed so as to preserve the essence of the psalmist's own phrase? For instance, "only towards God my soul turneth in silence." Kamphausen far outdoes our version; "Fürwahr, zu Gott ist still meine Seele" is his rendering of *v. 1 a*; "Fürwahr, an Gott gib still dich hin, meine Seele," his still more delightful version of *v. 5 a*. I have mentioned Kamphausen once already, because he has evidently made a study of the problems of translation. I have no wish, however, to disregard a recent English translator, who aspires, somewhat like Kamphausen, to

<sup>1</sup> Of the Ambrosian codex containing this version, Cornill remarks that it "is one of our most precious treasures, and to the critic simply indispensable" (*Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiël*, p. 49).

produce a genuine modern and yet faithful version,—I refer to Dr. De Witt of New Brunswick.<sup>1</sup> But his renderings are generally too bold, too individual, to be mentioned in connexion with a revised ecclesiastical version. Here his rendering is striking, though still slightly open to criticism. “Only be silent before God, my soul,” is his rendering of lxii. 1. He adopts Bickell’s correction *הִשָּׁבֵת* (comp. *v.* 6, Heb.), and for the sake of English idiom substitutes “before” for “unto.” The objection to “before” is that to those who love to use old phrases in the old meanings (like old songs with their own old tunes), to be “silent before God” means to wait for the coming of Jehovah to judgment (see Hab. ii. 20; Zech. ii. 13), which is very different from the psalmist’s meaning. It is true that this also applies to R.V.’s not felicitously expressed margin to lxv. 1 *a*.

Among other useful margins, let me notice lxix. 20, “sore sick” for “full of heaviness.” This is a typical specimen of a small but most thankworthy class of alterations. For another I might point to vi. 2, where R.V. rightly and most poetically substitutes “withered away” for “weak” (Segond, “sans force”); with more boldness on the part of the Revisers, the phraseology of the psalmists would in many similar points have recovered that freshness and pliancy—that which their own tongue expresses by the untranslatable *רַעֲנָן*—which makes it sometimes appear like a budding plant in the springtide of Palestine. Even at a cost to the ear, these changes ought to be introduced in a faithful translation; the question of course is whether a popular and

<sup>1</sup> This American work is entitled, *Praise-Songs of Israel: a New Rendering of the Book of Psalms.* (New York, 1884.) It represents almost always the Massoretic text. Its style is glowing and clear; it is thoroughly modern, and for that reason does not shrink from paraphrase. Exuberant friends of the author have judged my own version of the Psalms by Dr. De Witt’s canons of translation and of Hebrew scholarship. This does not hinder me from greatly admiring his work.



ecclesiastical version is justified in aiming at a high degree of faithfulness. What we have received from the Revisers is a compromise; let us at least be thankful for every step towards a higher ideal of translation. Teachers of the Bible will be helped even by small changes like that in lxix. 20, which throws a fresh ray of light on the psalmist's conception of human nature. Such writers and thinkers could not be satisfied with a refined spiritualism; "Leiblichkeit ist das Ende der Wege Gottes" is a motto which accurately expresses the conception of pure Hebraism. Body and soul or spirit are, in their combination, equally essential to life, and the central organ of both is the heart. In lxix. 20, whether or not we accept the late Dr. Weir's correction, (קַיִרָה) אָנֹכִי הוּא, it is certain that it is not merely in his "moral" or "spiritual" life but in his entire nature that the psalmist feels a sore and scarcely curable pain (comp. Jer. xv. 18, "why is my wound grievous (אָנֹכִי הוּא), refusing to be healed?"). So, again, in lxxiii. 21 we may be thankful for the margin "*Heb.* was in a ferment," which restores to the couplet the full parallelism or thought-rhythm. Segond, strange to say, is bolder, and renders the whole verse very happily, "Lorsque mon cœur s'aigrissait, et que je me sentais percé dans les entrailles." Fancy a sufferer, of the school of the author of *Job*, saying that "his heart was grieved"! And then turn to that shortest but most vigorous of the Asaphite psalms—the 76th. How vivid are the marginal notes on *vv.* 2, 3: "covert" for "tabernacle," "lair" for "dwelling-place," and "fiery shafts" or "lightnings" for "arrows"! I do not indeed believe that the two former are correct. "Covert" suggests a comparison with Jer. xxv. 38, and it is against the analogy of xxvii. 5, xxxi. 21 to suppose that Jehovah is here compared to a lion leaving its "covert" or "lair" to attack the enemy. No; *Shalem* (Jerusalem) suggests the thought of *shālôm* (peace); Zion and its temple are "a pavilion for

shade from the heat, and for a refuge and a shelter from storm and from rain" (Isa. iv. 6). But those who are sick of the word "tabernacle" would have welcomed, at any rate, "covert" into the text. Local colouring is introduced at least into the margin of lxxiv. 15, though to "ever-flowing" my own ear asks for "streams" rather than "rivers" as a companion; Dr. De Witt has "and (didst) dry up the rivers ever-flowing" (improving the rhythm of R.V. by reversing the order of the two important words). The love of alliteration has been condescended to in the preceding line, where "fountain and flood" still remains. When Sunday-school teachers accompany their clergymen to Palestine, "fountain and torrent" will be the only tolerable rendering.

In the R.V. of lxxxiii. 14 the change of "wheel" into "whirling dust" has the authority of most modern critics (see on Isa. xvii. 13). Hupfeld however still adheres to "wheel," and Milton's striking paraphrase deserves on poetical grounds to be read.

More marginal renderings might certainly have been expected on Ps. lxxviii. The most illuminative one is doubtless that on v. 13,—“When ye lie among the sheepfolds, (it is as) the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her pinions with yellow gold.” “Lying among the sheepfolds” is a current phrase for a quiet country life (Gen. xlix. 14; Judg. v. 16); the changeful hues of the dove's wings are an emblem either of the rich clothing of the Israelites after their success, or more generally of the varied happiness of Israel enjoying the sunshine of prosperity. Readers of Miss Whately's *Ragged Life in Egypt* will remember a striking passage on the lovely effects of light on the wings of pigeons on the housetops at Cairo. One of these effects is when their outspread wings catch the bright glow of the sun's slanting rays; another when they wheel round, and are seen against the light. That great alchemist, the sun of Egypt,

makes their plumage alternately appear like "yellow gold" and like molten silver. Dr. De Witt takes the same view of the construction, but seems to explain the silver and gold of the rich booty which fills the camps. His version is worth quoting for its clearness and ease,—

"When ye are in your camps among the sheepfolds,  
They are as a dove's wings, covered with silver,  
And her pinions with yellow gold."

The view of the sense implied in this rendering connects the verse excellently well with the preceding one. But rich clothing, as we know, was not the least coveted part of the booty (comp. Josh. vii. 21; Judg. v. 30; 2 Sam. i. 24), and certainly the dove was a symbol of Israel (comp. Dr. C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Studies*, p. 45), not of Israel's camps.

But I must draw my remarks on the marginal renderings to a close. A few more brief references, and I will pass on. At xc. 4, we find the alternative versions, "when it is past," and "when it passeth." The latter gives a more delicate shade of meaning. Time future seems long to us; time past, short. Standing on an imaginary bridge between the old day and the new, what a "span long" seems the old day as it vanishes; what an ample space stretches before us in what we can hardly yet call "to-day"! Next, let us be duly thankful for the margin at xci. 9. The insertion of the supplementary word אָמַרְתָּ, "hast said," simple as it seems, is due to the combined thought of critics of different periods, from Theodoret to Hupfeld and Riehm. The psalmist alludes to his noble confession in v. 2. This is probably the second word which has fallen out of the text אֲשֶׁר־ being sorely missed at the head of v. 1, which, by the canons of "subjective" (?) criticism should run, "Happy is the man that dwelleth . . . that abideth," comp. R.V. margin). The two remaining margins belong to Ps. xciv., a psalm which, as Bible-students know, is specially valuable for the history of religious thought, and indeed, in Leibnitz's

view, contained the kernel of his own philosophical argument against atheism. The bad side of the rule, requiring a two-thirds majority, comes out in the fact that the correction "instructeth" for "chastiseth" is thrust aside into the margin. The change however is urgently needed. The argument is not, God chastiseth the nations; consequently will not leave these bad men unpunished; but, God educates or instructs all mankind, consequently He will also chastise men (to whatever race they belong) when they require it. The Divine education of the human race is both "in word and in power"; it implies not only rewards but punishments. At *v.* 19 in the same psalm suffice it to point out the beautiful and suggestive margin, "doubts" for "thoughts."

Looking at the new renderings which fortunately have found admission into the text, I may venture, at this distance of time from the completion of the work, to recognise explicitly the great value of many of them to the student. Instead however of "traversing the palaces" (xlvi. 13 marg.), which the Revisers have sought to restore and beautify, I will but "mark well" a window here and a projecting bastion there, which may serve to represent the rest. I need not of course always coincide with the architect. Among small but not insignificant changes, it is worth noticing "only" for "truly," in lxii. 1. It was a mark of piety towards King James's revisers to make the change; for obviously אֶל־אֱלֹהִים in *v.* 1 (2) and אֶל־אֱלֹהִים in *v.* 5 (6) require the same rendering. It is surprising however that "surely" was retained in *v.* 9 (10). The particle אֶל occurs six times in this psalm, and *v.* 9 is now the only verse in which it is not rendered "only." Dr. De Witt, with many others, does in fact render *v.* 9 *a*, "Only a breath are the children of men"; and so Delitzsch. An excellent change is made in a psalm very familiar to Anglican church-goers—the 67th, where (*v.* 6) "Then shall

the earth yield her increase" becomes "The earth hath yielded her increase," which is not a "prophetic perfect," as many with Symmachus in pre-critical times have taken it. As Calvin points out, the poet regards the recent beautiful harvest as a pledge of the rich spiritual increase anticipated elsewhere in the psalm. In lxviii. 12, an English past tense becomes a present, "The Lord giveth the word" (for "gave"), though without a break between *v.* 10 and *v.* 11 it is perhaps difficult to make this appear natural to an English reader. In lxi. 4, there is a delicate touch revealing the hand of the good grammarian in the marginal "had to restore," which should have been noticed earlier. Tact and scholarship are shown in the improved rendering of lxxiv. 19 (the archaic termination, *-ath*, puzzled A.V.). A noteworthy change of tense occurs at lxxvii. 3 (present for past); the effect is to make *v.* 3 parallel to *v.* 1. *V.* 2 shows that the psalmist has passed out of the dark cloud, and recalls to mind the sad complaints which he uttered "in the day of his trouble"; comp. "and I said" (*v.* 10). I would deprecate being supposed to hold this view to be the correct one, but admit that the psalm is a difficult one to grasp in its unity.

Among other changes made in deference to improved notions of grammar, the student will notice that in line 3 of lxviii. 4, where "by his name Jah" gives place to "his name is Jah" (Dr. De Witt boldly, "I AM is His Name"), and that in *v.* 18, line 2, "for men" (with the odd margin, "*Heb.* in the man") becomes "among men." In xc. 12, "that we may get us an heart of wisdom," though unnecessarily rough in expression, accurately represents the pointed text. The new rendering in civ. 4 is surely a proof of the superiority of the Revisers to theological prejudice. Obviously but small credit is due to them for this; we have all learned by this time that the grammar and the lexicon are of no party. Preachers



will no doubt find out this text.—Regard for grammar is conspicuous in the new rendering of cix. 17. A too flowing translation would have checked some useful questions on the part of the student. “He loved cursing, and it came unto him,” that is, according to the anticipations of a strict believer in God’s moral government. “It came,” for the germ of punishment is in the sin; “when Ephraim offended by Baal,” says Hosea (xiii. 1), “he died.” In cxxii. 2, “Our feet are standing,” revolutionizes the psalm in a most happy sense. In cxxvi. 6, a lovely passage has received an accurate though not a charming version. In cxxxiii. 3, the innocent rationalizing of A.V. is removed.

But an important subject remains. It would not be right to conclude without some reference to the readings adopted in the text or recorded in the margin, which differ from the Massoretic text. Of course, the younger generation of critics will not think their number sufficient; but even by these few a great principle is recognised, and every serious Bible-student is the gainer. Now and then such readings have actually found their way into the text of the Revised Version. Thus in viii. 1, line 3, we find “who hast set thy glory upon the heavens.” This agrees with the rendering of the Targum, the Peshitto, Symmachus, and Jerome, and rationally viewed, requires an emendation of the text. It has, I know, been defended on grammatical grounds as a rendering of the text. Hengstenberg is of opinion that we might render literally, “Thou, in respect of whom the giving (not, the giving of) thy glory is above the heavens”; but the insight of this too stiff traditionalist is not equal to that of Hitzig, who remarks, “So thinks and writes no rational man.” The four ancient authorities must either have read *נְתַתָּה* (or *נְתַתָּה*) in their copies of the Hebrew, or have made a conjectural emendation, not in my opinion a very felicitous or poetical one. In xvi. 2 a less violent change has been made on the authority of the



Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Peshitto. The Hebrew text, as pointed, reads "Thou (fem.) hast said," which is supposed to mean, "Thou hast said, O my soul." Hitzig and Ewald, indeed, reject this supposition. According to them, אַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ is to be explained by an Aramaizing apocope. This seems very doubtful, when we find the Targum actually paraphrasing, "Thou sayest, O my soul." It is only fair to infer from the Septuagint translator's *Εἶπα τῷ Κυρίῳ*, that in his copy the affirmative ' of 1 sing. perf. was clearly visible. It must be remembered too that on the monument of King Mesha *-ti* is regularly written in full. The Revisers therefore were perfectly justified in emending the text; "*O my soul*, thou hast said unto the LORD," was a survival of that "atomistic" mode of handling the Scriptures, which takes little account of sense and context. I have already spoken of the next verse ("As for the saints . . ., they are," etc.), in which the Revisers emend the text by omitting the ׀ prefixed to אֲדִירִי. I see that this has the authority of De Wette, who renders (perhaps with more insight into Hebrew idiom<sup>1</sup>), "Die Heiligen, welche im Lande, sind die Herrlichen, an denen ich all mein Lust habe." It is difficult to know what else the Revisers were to do. Their version yields a fair sense (with a little pressing), viz., that those who are faithful to the Holy God are in the psalmist's eyes more fitly styled "excellent" or "noble" than those false-hearted "princes" who have betrayed their country and their faith. I do not know a more interesting problem than that presented by this verse, and so make no apology for returning to the passage in a fresh connexion:

Several of the more remarkable of the various readings in

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, *Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, § 310a, points out that the rendering "quoad" for—׀ in cases like xvi. 3 is too emphatic. It does no doubt point to something which the writer or speaker would have us not overlook, but so gently that in our languages it can only be expressed by the tone.

the margin (*e.g.* that in xxii. 16) have been so abundantly disowned of late that further comment seems superfluous. A slight change at xxxvii. 36 is worth noticing, because it is typical of a large class of scribe's errors. Who can doubt that **וַיַּעֲבֹר** should rather be **וַיִּעָבֶר**? A similar error of the ear occurs in Zech. iv. 2 and other places (comp. *Grätz, Psalmen*, p. 135, and my crit. note on Isa. li. 19). In xlix. 19, the Revisers have altered the Massoretic text by substituting **יְבוּיָהּ** for **תְּבוּיָהּ**. "Thou shalt go," and "It (*i.e.* the soul) shall go," are both obviously impossible; the mistake was caused by the close neighbourhood of a 2 pers. fem. imperfect. The margin might have mentioned that the Septuagint has *Ἐισέλθεται*, which it would be absurd to interpret of the soul. On lx. 4 there is a marginal note which to all intents and purposes records a various reading.

"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee,  
That they may flee from before the bow,"

is an incomplete sentence. The only interpretation, at once easy and striking, is that of Ewald, who, however, fails to make it self-evident by not seeing that a little word (**נֶסֶם**) has dropped out. The sense is, "Thou gavest us indeed a banner, when we took the field for the true religion; but what a banner! Far from being a rallying-point for God's warriors, it seemed as if only intended to scatter us in flight." The characteristic word-play on **נֶסֶם** "banner" and **נִסְּסוּ** "to put to flight" reminds us of one in a neighbouring psalm (lvi. 9). In lxxiii. 10, both text and margin seem to me to presuppose a doubtful view of **שׁוּב**, against which it is enough to refer to Delitzsch's note. Dr. De Witt's version of the passage is as follows,—

"Therefore God's people turn away after them,  
And enjoy the waters of a full stream."

This is characteristically flowing, but could hardly be re-translated into the Massoretic Hebrew!

In some degree no doubt every translation which is at all readable is now and then open to this criticism. The R.V. for instance of lxxii. 15 leaves the reader in happy ignorance of the awkwardness of the first line in the Hebrew:—"And they shall live" (וַיִּחִי) looks very much like a textual emendation! The object of course is to show that the king is not the subject of וַיִּחִי; but is not this an exegetical prejudice? I do not mean to assert that the line as it stands can be translated so as to give a sense.

The R.V. of cxvi. 11 also *appears* to presuppose an emendation of the vowel-points. "All men are a lie" can only be כָּל־הָאָדָם כְּזָב (see lxii. 9, Heb. 10). A regard for the weaknesses of popular exegesis may perhaps excuse the alteration. "A lie" means "a disappointing object of trust"; "liars" may more easily be misinterpreted. But to excuse the change is not to justify it.

I need scarcely pause to defend "we are his" for "not we ourselves" in c. 3. In this case, the Hebrew margin is manifestly superior to the Hebrew text. The antithesis, "he, not we," is certainly possible; but taking this line in connexion with the next, and with the parallel passage xcv. 7*a*, there can be no doubt that the antithetic reading should be rejected.—The rendering "from the south" in cvii. 3 is retained from A.V., together with the margin, "*Heb.* from the sea." It would have perhaps been more in character, had the Revisers substituted "sea" for "south," considering that, as Hupfeld remarks, "כַּיִם" can in accordance with usage mean nothing but 'from the west.'" The same difficulty has to be met in Isa. xlix. 16.—The reading recorded on cx. 3 is really a boon. Strong in external authority, it is still stronger by its suitability to the context. We have now, in the same verse, both the time and the place of the mustering (comp. lxxxvii. 1, cxxxiii. 3). ׀ and ׀ are confounded, as Isa. viii. 9 and often. See also 2 Chron. xx. 21, where not the warriors, but the singers who

preceded them, are said, if the margin of R.V. is correct, to "praise in the beauty of holiness," *i.e.* in holy attire. On the gain from adopting the margins at cxix. 128, there cannot be two opinions; and those at cxxxix. 20, cxlii. 5, well deserve attention. Much more might have been done by the Revisers; but that so much should have been done by a company, is matter for thankful surprise. At this distance of time from the completion of the task, it is not difficult to look upon the stately volumes of the Revision with a considerable degree of impartiality.

T. K. CHEYNE.

---

### EZRA.

IN the first six chapters of the book of Ezra some account is given of the fortunes of the Jews under Cyrus and Darius. Between the sixth and the seventh chapters a gap of sixty years is overleaped, and the narrative is resumed with an account of events in the reign of Artaxerxes, who acceded in the year 465 B.C. In the seventh year of this monarch's reign Ezra received from him the amplest commission to inquire into the affairs of the returned captives, and to make such regulations in their favour as might approve themselves to his judgment. Ezra was allowed to take with him to Jerusalem as many of his countrymen as chose to return. He was amply furnished with the means of journeying in comfort, and besides carried handsome gifts to the Temple. And to the imperial firman were added the remarkable words: "Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven: for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons?" It has very naturally been suggested that in these words we may see an indication that Artaxerxes suspected that the troubles of the

early years of his reign had arisen from the anger of the God of the Jews. It is also to be considered that he was brought up in the household with his father's wife Esther, whose story must have been well known to him, and whose influence he may have felt.

Ezra with his little band set out from Babylon on the first day of Nisan or March (458 B.C.); and nine days after he halted and reviewed the people, and finding that there were no Levites among them he sent to a neighbouring town, and was speedily joined by thirty-eight or thirty-nine Levites and two hundred and twenty Nethinim. He then proclaimed a fast, that prayer might be made to God for a safe journey. They were to pass through a region infested with robbers and marauders, and to all such they offered, in the treasure they carried with them, an inviting prey. The natural course for Ezra to adopt would have been for him to ask from Artaxerxes a military escort for his caravan. But his own reason for declining to do so is good and indicative of his character. "I proclaimed a fast there, at the river Ahava, that we might humble ourselves before our God, to seek of Him a straight way, for us, and for our little ones, and for all our substance. For I was ashamed to ask of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way: because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them that seek Him, for good; but His power and His wrath is against all them that forsake Him." Such consistency and courage are worthy of all honour: worthy of honour also is his fear of bringing reproach upon his God. He saw that want of faith on his part would cause the heathen to think meanly of his God—a result he could not bear to contemplate. The repute of Jehovah was more precious to him than the treasure he carried. He would rather risk the treasure than lower in men's minds their idea of God's power to protect His own.



In the management of difficult affairs a man's character quickly reveals itself. Ezra had in charge important material interests, the lives of many defenceless persons, and a considerable amount of property; but this did not dim his perception of the moral consequences of his actions. The hazards which would have shaken the nerve of a lesser man, and made him oblivious of everything else, did not disturb his mind or divert his attention from the finer issues of his conduct. Besides, he was a man of straightforward and consistent character. His convictions and his conduct were of a piece. Throughout his administration in Jerusalem the most striking feature is his repugnance to own a law verbally, and to deny it in his life. Here, in the first manifestation of his character, he exhibits the same thoroughgoing consistency.

The same keenness of perception and innate truthfulness are discernible in his account of the crowd who assembled at Jerusalem to hear his decision about their mixed marriages. "All the people," he says, "sat in the street trembling because of this matter, and for the great rain." The solemnity of the occasion did not prevent him from discriminating between a merely physical and a religious emotion. The earliest biographer of Julius Cæsar tells us that he liked to wear the laurel crown, which afterwards became distinctive of empire, partly because it was given him by his fellow citizens in recognition of service done, partly because it covered his baldness. Everywhere motives thus mingle. It is sometimes difficult to detect how much of our emotion is due to religious feeling, and how much to physical causes. It is difficult to know whether the tear that gathers in the eye while we pray or look upon suffering is due to nervous weakness or to strength of sympathy, whether our disinclination to certain amusements be due to heavenliness of mind or to moroseness of temper, whether our security from this or that common



vice be due to strength of will or to weakness of health, whether our indifference to applause or advancement in life is the fruit of a disappointed and soured spirit or of a spirit which is satisfied with a heavenly inheritance.

Ezra went to Jerusalem prepared to find much that would grieve and shock him, but he was thoroughly taken by surprise when informed by some of the influential men that mixed marriages had become common. The intense horror with which he viewed these marriages is remarkable. No doubt we must make allowance for what we consider oriental extravagance in the expression of feeling; but after all deduction an unusual degree of emotion remains, and is not easily explained. For although intermarriage with heathens had always been forbidden, the law had been so frequently and notoriously broken that it might well be considered obsolete. In one instance indeed something like Divine sanction had been given to such a marriage. When Boaz married Ruth, a Moabitish woman, she was honoured by becoming the ancestress of David and of the royal line terminating in Christ. On what principle then did Ezra thus abruptly resuscitate the law?

Probably he was influenced by the consideration that a practice which at one time and under certain circumstances may be legitimate and harmless becomes at another time and in other conditions wrong and hurtful. At no period of Jewish history could intermarriage with the heathen have been more dangerous to the nation than at this time, when they were few in numbers, and had little strength to maintain their distinctive belief and hopes. They had just returned from an exile to which they had been subjected on account of their assimilation to the heathen, and this renewed tendency to obliterate their distinctiveness seemed to Ezra an ominous weakness. Almost all he has to say therefore about his administration concerns these marriages.

The principle on which he acted is a sound one, and finds

constant application in national affairs. More disastrous and threatening to all that we value in our nation than the vice with which Ezra contended is our national vice of drunkenness. This vice is notorious, it is shameful, it makes us the scorn of other nations and loathsome to ourselves. In dealing with it Ezra's principle must find application. But this principle, which certainly should be understood by all who take upon them to manage social matters, is wholly overlooked by those who plead that wine is furnished by God as one of the chief articles of human consumption, has been by common consent chosen as the symbol and accompaniment of joy, and was freely bestowed by our Lord Himself on his fellow guests. Such pleadings omit the consideration, that what is in ordinary circumstances allowable and laudable may in special circumstances be fraught with disaster and reprehensible in the extreme. Lively conversation and the loud mirth of children are good, but they are not encouraged in the room where a dying parent is trying to catch a few minutes' sleep. Paul denounced those who prohibited marriage, but none the less did he recognise that the uncertain and unsettled times in which he lived put marriage in the category of imprudences so far as he himself was concerned.

On the same principle we ought to consider "the present distress"; what it is becoming and commendable in a good citizen to do in view of the special circumstances of our time. We reap many advantages from being citizens of this country in this age, and it is a small return to make, if we find ourselves in one or two particulars restricted, to allow the restriction with grace and hopefulness. Certainly the man is wrong both in heart and judgment who shuts his eyes to the special wants of his time, and refuses in any respect to modify his own conduct in consideration of these wants. His conduct may be perfectly proper in the abstract, he may never exceed the bounds of temperance

in his use of intoxicants; but in reason and in justice he is bound to consider whether the present emergency does not call upon him to regulate his habits differently from the manner required by abstract right. If his neighbour is ill of a nervous fever, he does not persist that music is a good thing and he likes it; his natural sympathy makes it impossible for him in these circumstances to act as he ordinarily would. Does natural delicacy of feeling, does consideration for others, find no room for exercise where the well-being of so many is concerned? Are we to indulge in precisely the same habits as would be proper were society in a healthy condition? Are we prepared to say that there is no modification in our conduct that is either possible or required by the crying evil of our time, which every good citizen and every good Christian should be proud to have a hand in putting down?

But while a citizen of the rank and file has his own responsibilities, the burden a leader has to bear is heavy indeed. Ezra found it so. He found himself compelled to lead in dealing with a widespread vice with which many of the leading men were identified, and in endeavouring to eradicate which he would evoke opposition and hatred. This was a more serious affair than any he had bargained for in coming to Jerusalem. Like Esther, Ezra finds that prominent position carries incalculable hazards. We all find that coveted positions have unthought-of duties attached, and make calls upon our fortitude, our generosity, our capacity for sacrifice, which we little thought of when we entered them. Men are betrayed into much of the good they do. They accomplish good by the pressure of circumstances as much as by free intention. Ezra was too true a priest, too true a patriot, too true a man—whichever you please—to separate himself from his people and pursue his own comfortable and respectable way while they were living in sin. His sympathy with his

fellow citizens is shown in his dismay when he heard of the prevalent irregularity. He rent his garments, tore his hair, and sank involuntarily on the ground, unstrung and overwhelmed with grief. His spontaneous identification of himself with his people is further shown in the first words he uttered when, after sitting hours upon the ground, he rose to his knees and said, "O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to Thee, my God: for our iniquities are increased over our head, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens." It was this involuntary and profound feeling for and with the people that compelled him to attempt the reformation, and that gave him power to carry it through. As usual in such cases his grief and concern stirred similar feelings in others, and gradually there gathered round him a few helpful men, a sufficient number of godly and patriotic spirits to cleanse the community. The bold resolve to compel separation in all mixed marriages was taken and was carried through.

Artists who have felt themselves equal to the task of portraying scenes in which are exhibited some of the keenest and most mingled feelings of human nature, have sometimes chosen Abraham's dismissal of Hagar and her child as a subject admitting of much delicacy and pathos in its treatment. There is, in the scenes which must have everywhere followed Ezra's decree, a wider field for the artist's power of setting before the eye the anguish of separation and the strife between duty and affection. Valid reason for a brief reprieve before the final leave-taking was found in the unusual storminess of the weather. Husbands who were prepared to obey the law and part with the women and children who had made their homes could not find it in their heart to turn them out houseless and unsheltered, or to add any needless harshness to a fate in itself hard and pitiable. The anguish and trial of these few days who can recount? How was the husband to go home

from the assembly at Jerusalem to his home in the country, and tell the children who ran to meet him and show him all they had been doing in his absence, that these gardens were no longer to be theirs, and that shortly they must quit the roof that had sheltered them since their birth? How was he to enter and tell his wife, perhaps old and infirm and unable to provide for herself, perhaps young and but just rooted in her new hopes and duties, that she must return to her own people, and count this no longer her home? What agonised pleadings, what passages of wild entreaty, reproach, and fondest love, what complications of miseries, anxieties about the future, unveilings of a hitherto disguised past, what strife between purest affections and sense of duty, what givings-way and returns to a better mind, what violent openings up of every man's heart, are all covered under the bare historical statement, "They made an end with all the men that had taken strange wives"!

But through all this misery one thing becomes clear, that the people are determined to obey the law of God. A dead letter it may have been in times past: a dead letter it is no longer. Since first given it had never, even in Israel's best times, received a more signal homage. The people who could carry through such a reform as this, had in them a strength of character that might gladden the heart of any ruler, and that proved them capable of a great future. It was a small matter that they restored the Feast of Tabernacles, which had been obsolete almost from the time of its institution. It was a small matter that they extolled the law in psalms like the 119th. But in this gravest of practical reforms, that cut so deeply into their daily life and deepest affections, they proved themselves worthy of the law and of Jehovah their lawgiver. There is no proof of zeal for God and His law in appointing religious services or in reading or writing religious books. We may thus give expression to feelings and aims which had better be sup-



pressed. Our zeal for God and our sense of His holiness are tested when circumstances require us to give practical effect to what we know to be God's will, to construct our life in obedience to its requirements even when to do so tears the heart and blights every hope we cherish.

To give the law a commanding place was the task of Ezra's life. To make it the living force which should mould the national life was his constant aim. Historians of the period point out that up to Ezra's time the nation had been guided through every crisis by the voice of a living prophet; henceforth they were guided by the written word. Before Ezra the prophet was everything; after him the scribe was everything. For the living voice of the prophet there was now substituted a code or canon of authoritative Scriptures.

Contemporaneous with this important change, if not wholly the cause of it, a remarkable change in the social condition of the Jews took place. During their residence in Babylon they had learned the value of education and the power of an educated profession in a country. Ezra brought with him to Jerusalem a number of educated men, men who could transcribe, read, translate into the dialect of the people, and explain the Hebrew Scriptures. And with the re-instatement of the law, the recognition of the importance of these guardians of the law went hand in hand. Before the captivity no arrangement existed for the regular and thorough instruction of the people. The law was little known, and was scarcely used at all as a text-book of instruction. But now this condition of things was no longer tolerated. The law was carefully edited, copies of it were multiplied, well trained teachers of it were scattered through the land, and accordingly the need for living prophets was less felt. The scribe was henceforth the guide in Israel. The days of inspiration were left behind. God was listened to no longer through the living



voice of men fired with zeal for holiness and truth, but through the record of what He had uttered to the fathers. The people learned to live at a farther remove from the Divine presence. Between the living, present God and themselves they put the letter of the law, and gradually came to take less and less to do with the living God, hiding themselves from Him in what was meant to manifest Him. But no strictness in adhering to the written word can ever compensate for alienation from the living God. The record of what God said to others is valuable, and the Bible must always be immeasurably precious; but the study of it can never take the place of our own direct communion with the living God, and our present recognition of His guidance of our own life and spirit.

Ezra, then, accomplished one of the greatest works in Jewish history. He diffused a knowledge of the law, and he rooted in the Jewish mind the conviction that the law must become a reality in the life of every man. His successors, in their endeavours to bring under the law's dominion every detail of daily life, lost sight of the great principles of obedience and the broad laws of morality in a cloud of minute and fanciful and useless regulations. They made void the law by their traditions. They spent their energies in the letter, and lost sight of the spirit of obedience and holiness. The law became more to them than the God who gave it or the brother for whose sake it was given. So that in the days of our Lord the scribes and guardians of the law were dangerous to true religion and morality, devoid of love and tenderness for sinners, and absorbed in a superficial routine of paltry observances.

But this must not be laid to Ezra's charge. Nehemiah may have had in him the germs of the pharisee, but in Ezra a different spirit is discernible. In fact, if the root of pharisaism may be traced to this period, there also dates from it a saying which cuts at the same root and indicates

with matchless point the true spirit of obedience. When the law was read to the people by Ezra and his friends, and when for the first time they heard its requirements, they trembled and wept, knowing how flagrantly they had neglected it in times past, and alarmed at the prospect of having to live up to it now. They were departing with heavy hearts to strive so to keep an impossible law as to escape the severe punishment of their Lawgiver. Their teachers at once detect the error of their mood, and with a parting word bid them go home, not to mourn and weep, but to feast and be glad; "for," as they profoundly add, "the joy of the Lord is your strength."

Gloom secures the failure it anticipates. Reluctant obedience, that from the first feels itself overtaxed, will never accomplish its task. Fear is fatal to the spirit of religious service, for service rendered through fear is necessarily unacceptable to God. Love that fills the soul with gladness and buoyancy and persistent vigour must precede acceptable obedience. We must know God sufficiently to see the glory of being called to serve Him before we can yield Him acceptable obedience. Obedience which is constrained, rendered under compulsion and through fear, is unacceptable, feeble, brief, irregular. True obedience must be an obedience in which we can find our life, the constant and fullest expression of ourselves. It must be like the discovery of his fit profession or calling to a young man, a thing he gives himself to with gladness, ardour, and hope. God lives not by constraint, does good not by compulsion; and to the same life He graciously calls us. No other life is possible: An eternity of gloomy, half-hearted, enforced obedience is out of the question. We must so know God as to learn to rejoice in Him, and the joy of the Lord will be our strength. All other strength is delusive. It may do to begin with, and may serve for awhile, but it cannot last and be the strength of life eternal. To recognise God's

supremacy is the beginning of all strength. To recognise that God is God, and that His supremacy is identical with the absolute wisdom and absolute love; to perceive that only by doing God's will and work can our strength be well spent, and that His inviting us to and fitting us for actual friendship with Him is infinitely gracious—thus to know God and the hope of His calling is lasting joy and strength.

MARCUS DODS.

---

DR. MACLAREN.

DR. MACLAREN'S life-work has been that of a preacher. Though he has published not a few volumes of sermons, he has scarcely been in the strict sense an author. The first collection of discourses issued by him was printed for private circulation in Manchester in 1859, and is thus prefaced: "These sermons have no pretensions to accuracy and completeness either of matter or of manner. Some attempt has been made to prune roughnesses and repetitions, which, though of little moment in spoken address, are grave blemishes when in print. But these and other faults are too deeply ingrained to be got rid of by any process short of recasting the whole. For the most part therefore the very faithful reports of Mr. W. H. Hill have been printed *verbatim*." Two editions of this volume were privately printed, and then, in 1863, Messrs. Macmillan showed their usual discernment in reproducing the volume, with a few additions and omissions, in what is now so well known as the first series of *Sermons Preached in Manchester*. The same publishers, it will be remembered, took up a book privately printed in Birmingham, and gave to the wide public *John Inglesant*.

The success of this book was very great, and Dr. MacLaren has since issued many volumes, particularly of late years, when his sermons have been regularly reported. In

connexion with all of these, it is of the highest importance to remark that they were never committed to writing. Beyond a very few notes, Dr. Maclaren writes nothing for the pulpit. They are printed, with very little change, from reporter's notes. A somewhat strained and heated volume, *A Spring Holiday in Italy*, was delivered as a series of addresses; and an excellent little book, *The Life of David as Reflected in his Psalms*, is evidently made up of materials previously used in the pulpit.

In occasional addresses Dr. Maclaren has very clearly explained his theory of preaching, and the strength and weakness of his sermons may easily be traced thereto.

Preaching in his view is proclaiming. It is not arguing or speculating: it is the delivery of a message. This message is delivered with a view to practical effect. If this effect is not produced, the preaching hurts instead of helping. It arouses emotion that finds no vent in action, and reacts disastrously on the spirit. The first aim of preaching is to convert souls to Christ. Whether men need to be redeemed from gross sins or no, they need in all cases to be redeemed from the bondage of the things of time. When the soul has made the great surrender to Jesus Christ its battle is not over. It remains among the old captors and enslavers, and it needs to be shielded, fortified, recalled to itself. Thus it is the work of the preacher to teach Christ as the Wisdom as well as to preach Him as the Power of God. On this view certain things follow.

1. Such preaching is grounded on an acceptance of the authority of Scripture, and a conviction that its broad meaning and drift are plain. It testifies of Christ, and all texts lead to Him. According to preachers of Dr. Maclaren's school, one of the most serious injuries it is possible to inflict on religious life is to induce a doubt as to the simplicity and straightforwardness of Scripture.

So much is common to Dr. Maclaren with other preachers. But his distinction is that he, while accepting the main conclusions of evangelical interpreters, is a *practical* believer in the manifoldness of Scripture, the infinite freshness and novelty which make the miracle of inspiration. We have heard it said that all the years of his ministry he has every day read one chapter of the Old and one chapter of the New Testament in the original. He is an exact and fresh exegete. It follows that while he always begins with a text and always ends with Jesus Christ, his hearers are led delightedly from text to Christ by a new way; or, if the way is not new, it is bordered with fresh flowers. And all the sermon rises plainly from the text. Thus the words, Mnason of Cyprus, an old disciple, are made to yield their lesson thus: "Old disciple" means "a disciple from the beginning," one of those who had seen Christ in the flesh. Mnason does not seem to have known Paul before; but though many Jerusalem Christians looked suspiciously on the great Apostle, this old man had full sympathy with him, and opened heart and hand to receive him. The lessons are: I. *Hold fast to your early faith and to the Christ whom you have known.* "How beautiful it is to see a man, below whose feet time is crumbling away, holding firmly by the Lord whom he has loved and served all his days, and finding that the pillar of cloud which guided him while he lived begins to glow in its heart of fire as the shadows fall, and is a pillar of light to guide him when he comes to die." II. *Be ready to welcome new thoughts and ways.* Mnason did not say he was too old to go in with these changes, and that he knew Christ longer and so better than Paul. He united constancy and flexibility of mind. Then, III., the words suggest the *beauty that may dwell in an obscure life.* A disciple—that is the noblest summary of a life. "A thinker? a hero? a great man? a millionaire? No, a disciple."



2. Such preaching is directly practical. It aims at producing an immediate effect. Hence it must be in the language of the day, it must be interesting, and it must be memorable. Dr. Maclaren's preaching is all this in an eminent degree. His style is sharp, clear, nervous, without one trace of mysticism or obscurity. It is the language of the time, and sometimes in his desire to make truth and reality imperiously supreme the preacher oversteps the limits of good taste. But one feels he is always in earnest, that he never uses phrases conventionally, that he says things with a sense of their practical recoil upon himself. Then he is a most interesting preacher. His illustrations from life are profuse and illuminating; they are indeed a great feature of his preaching. Above all, he is memorable. He has the clear, logical Scottish intellect, and can divide his texts and lead up to his conclusion in the most natural and least commonplace manner. What is remembered is that which is neither unnatural nor commonplace. Hearing sermons is often very fatiguing, because one feels no progress is being made. The text is announced; we wander forty minutes through a wilderness, and end where we began. Dr. Maclaren never speaks without saying something; his sermons have a beginning, middle, and end.

But all this would avail little if it were alone. Mere shrewdness in the pulpit is not enough. That is what people make way by during six days of the week. They do not care to miss it on the seventh; but they want besides emotion, sympathy, poetry. One of the most successful preachers to the masses in London was shrewd even to coarseness; but he passed in a moment from the exposure of some mercantile trick into the profoundest mysticism. Mr. Spurgeon is a mystic in the fleshly vesture of John Bull. Dr. Maclaren is nothing at all of a mystic, and this is his greatest weakness; but he is a poet—with close affinities to the Laureate. He is the Tennyson of



preachers. His thoughts are coloured, not shadowed or cloud-fringed. His expressions are often highly poetical; as in all imaginative prose, except that of the very first rank, we have the forms of poetry often unconsciously used. Besides he has the Celtic temperament, its melancholy and its chivalry. Along with the clearest perception of fact he has the Celtic reaction against its despotism. He has the Celtic loyalty to the unpopular, which holds by a man "though his back be at the wa'." He is a devoted champion of the Church he adorns. Few men go more thoroughly with the wise and pious old counsel, "Sparta is your portion; do your best for Sparta."

Dr. Maclaren's beliefs are distinctly orthodox. We should imagine from various hints that he hesitates between the theories of the endless conscious existence of the lost and their extinction. But he is not afraid to use the appeal to fear, and he insists upon this life as the time for the calls and succours of grace. He is true to the Scripture, which again and again "limiteth a certain time, saying To-day"; and would say with the saint, *Scrutetur qui potest judiciorum Ejus tam magnum profundum, caveat tamen precipitium*. He has certain favourite thoughts which often recur. One is, that the glory of God is His grace, not His wisdom or power. Another is that Christ foresaw and meant His death. It is from this fact that he approaches the doctrine of the atonement and interprets the life of Christ. So called lives of Christ that do not take this as their guide he repudiates. Another idea with which his readers are very familiar is that of the immortality which some obscure men and women have through the Bible—"Quartus, a brother," and the rest. "They crossed the illuminated track, and there they blaze," prophesying the true and sure immortality of souls that trust in Christ. As a Biblical critic he is, as shown by his book on David, as well as incidentally

elsewhere, conservative, though he is evidently familiar with the recent reconstructions of the Old Testament.

Dr. Maclaren's defects are those of his qualities.

1. He has not helped to solve the great problems of thought. He has not written on the theological or philosophical problems that perplex the mind of our time. We do not find him discussing the doctrine of election, or the philosophy of miracles, or the inspiration of the Old Testament. So keen an intellect might have done much to help us in these perplexities, and such service would no doubt have given Dr. Maclaren a position as a thinker which he cannot now claim. But it would be a mistake to say he has not faced these problems. We believe he has faced them with all his great powers, and deliberately resolved to leave them. For he holds that preaching is preaching certainties, and nothing besides. He holds also that it is the duty of the preacher not to build up a system of theology, but to explain the Scriptures. And he would say, we doubt not, that he finds both Arminianism and Calvinism in the epistles, that each is a side of the truth, and that the absolute statement of either is an injustice to the manifoldness of truth. He would say also that reasoning on such subjects as the atonement is, beyond very narrow limits, useless or worse. He is one of the many who would deprecate with Newman "the exercise of thought upon matters in which, from the constitution of the human mind, thought cannot be brought to any successful issue"; nay, who feel that if this is not so, there is no religion for them. He speaks of "that abomination which maketh desolate called intellectual preaching." Problems about the philosophy of miracles he might not consider higher or more hopeful than that of the squaring of the circle. Let it be remembered by those who are not with us in these matters that the refusal to speculate rises often not from indolence, but from the

reverse ; from the fact that the mind has done its best, and failed—failed with the feeling that success is impossible. How many can say with Omar <sup>1</sup>—

“ Myself, when young, did eagerly frequent  
 Doctor and saint—and heard great argument  
 About it and about ; but ever more  
 Came out of the same door as in I went ” !

2. It is true also that he has not much Church feeling. The very highest type of preaching implies, we imagine, a subsidence of the critical faculty before the majesty of great expressions of thought and feeling consecrated by the consciousness of the Church. We see in some sermons a spirit kindling at the fire of a magnificent thought ; we draw near, and are kindled also. We must use the language of to-day ; but there is a language of the Church that persists, and that ought to colour and master the speech of the hour.

3. Neither does he say much about the questions of the day in the light of the gospel. The best sermons are those that are a heap of ashes once preached ; they have set souls on fire, and have so perished. Dr. Maclaren’s sermons, from their plan, do not admit of much intellectual advance ; and indeed his sermons of to-day are no improvement upon those of thirty years ago. But that is because he at once reached and has maintained the perfection of his particular style. In his own line of things he is an unrivalled master.

Preachers, even more than hearers, have felt this. We have heard of a preacher who read one-half of Dr. Maclaren’s first volume with intense and growing admiration, and then bade the preacher farewell, because he could not resist the temptation to reproduce his divisions. But we have heard of many more who have fallen : and indeed we doubt if there are many who have not in one way or another succumbed. Dr. Maclaren’s divisions are often final and irresistible. He fills up in a form too compressed

<sup>1</sup> Fitzgerald’s translation, first edition.

and poetical for the multitude; but spread out and popularized, his sermons may win a real command of the masses. Our belief is that Dr. Maclaren, more than any other except Robertson, has altered the whole manner of preaching in England and America, and that immeasurably for the better.

From our point of view he cannot print too much. His literary reputation is not increased by the volumes which are now appearing. But his divisions of texts and his comments are such that one wishes he may be spared to go over the whole Bible. There have been more subtle, learned and poetical preachers in our time, though not many; there have been a few far more profound: but we believe Dr. Maclaren's sermons may be read when the rest are forgotten, because he, above all his contemporaries, has faithfully interpreted the Scriptures.

EDITOR.

---

### JOB AND SOLOMON.

WE congratulate Professor Cheyne<sup>1</sup> on the firstfruits of his return to University life. The brilliant and masterly volume which he has now published is a real contribution to the study of the Old Testament. It embodies evidently the results of long and patient study; it opens new and suggestive lines of reflection; it is enjoyably written; the author's wide and diversified reading makes every page attractive. So full indeed is it of thought, that most readers, probably, will appreciate it better the second time of reading than the first. Nor is the author forgetful of those who may be ambitious to pursue their researches beyond the limits of his own volume: at the end of each division of the book, a paragraph headed "Aids to the Student," acquaints him with all that has been most recently said on the subject of the

<sup>1</sup> *Job and Solomon; or, The Wisdom of the Old Testament.* By Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation at Oxford, Canon of Rochester. (London: Kegan Paul, 1887.)

section; and valuable supplementary information is also to be found in the *Appendix*.

The volume consists of four divisions, dealing respectively with Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, and Ecclesiastes. The treatment of each is similar, the only difference being that Ecclesiasticus is handled less comprehensively than the other three books. First the reader is made to understand the contents of the book under examination by means of illustrative quotations, and accompanying comments: the traits in which it reflects the age to which it belongs are noted and discussed: its structure and scope are examined: lastly questions of authorship and date are considered from the points of view successively of history, criticism, and philology. A special chapter is also devoted to a consideration of the moral and religious significance of each book. This outline may suffice to indicate the ground covered by Prof. Cheyne's volume; but his delicacy of touch, and still more his rare power of imparting freshness to all that he writes, and of sustaining his reader's interest even where the subject is of a technical nature, can only be learnt from a perusal of the work itself. We venture, however, to extract one or two passages in illustration of its style. On p. 77, in explanation of the beautiful verses (Job xxxviii. 12-15)—

“ Hast thou ever in thy life given charge to the Morning,  
And shewn its place to the Dawn,  
That it may take hold of the skirts of the earth,  
So that the wicked are shaken out of it,  
And the earth changes as clay under a seal,  
And (all things) stand forth as in a garment,  
And light is withheld from the wicked,  
And the arm lifted up is broken? ”

Prof. Cheyne writes :

“ How very vivid! The personified Dawn seizes the coverlet under which the earth has slept at its four ends, and shakes the evil-doers out of it like flies; upon which form and colour return to the earth, as clay (a Babylonian image) receives a definite form from the seal, and as the sad coloured night-wrapper is exchanged for the bright, embroidered holiday-robe.”

Was ever a text more graphically expounded? And from the chapter on the “ Praise of Wisdom ” (Prov. i.-ix.), in explanation of the great personification in Prov. viii. 22 ff. (p. 159):

“ Wisdom is now presented to us, in the familiar dialect of poetry, as the first-born Child of the Creator. There is but one Wisdom; though her forms are many, in her origin she is one. The Wisdom who presided over the ‘ birth ’



of nature is the same who by her messengers (the 'wise men') calls mankind to turn aside from evil (ix. 3). There can therefore be no real disharmony between nature and morality; the picture leaves no room for an Abri-man, in this and other respects resembling the cosmogony in Gen. i., and portions of the striking descriptions in Job xxvi., xxviii., xxxviii. There is also no time when we can say that 'Wisdom was not.' Faith declares that even in that primitive Chaos of which our reason has a horror, Divine Wisdom reigned supreme. The heavenly ocean, the ancient hills, the combination of countless delicate atoms to form the ground, the fixing of the vault of heaven on the world-encircling ocean, the separation of sea and dry-land—all these were later works of God than the Architect through whom He made them. And how did the Architect work? By a 'divine improvisation' which allowed no sense of effort or fatigue, and which still continues with unabated freshness. But though her sportive path [viii. 30] can still be traced in the processes of nature, her highest delight is in the regeneration of the moral life of humanity."

After quoting the passage (Prov. viii. 22-31), Prof. Cheyne continues:

"The bold originality of this passage requires no proof. It cuts away at a blow the old mythical conception of the world as the work of God's hands, and of an arbitrary omnipotence. 'God,' as Hooker says, 'is a law both to Himself and to all things beside': 'His wisdom hath stinted the effects of His power.' 'Nor is the freedom of the will of God any whit abated, let, or hindered, by means of this; because the imposition of this law upon Himself is His own free and voluntary act' ('Jehovah produced me'). The idea then of the world as a Cosmos was not adopted by the Jews from the Greeks: it arose of itself as soon as religious men pondered over the phenomena of nature. The author of *Job* took up the idea, and re-expressed it worthily in xxviii. 12-28, the chief difference between him and his predecessor being that he denies the attainableness for man of wisdom in the larger sense, while the author of the 'Praise of Wisdom' does not raise the question whether the higher department of wisdom is open to human inquiry."

Let these extracts be supplemented by the remarks in the chapter on "the religious value of the Book of Proverbs" (p. 176): 'Can any Christian help seeing the poetic foregleams of Christ in the great monologue of Wisdom in chap. viii.? . . . Will this great section ever lose its value as a symbolic picture of the combined transcendence and immanence of the Divine Being?'

These extracts will exemplify the power possessed by Professor Cheyne of instructing his reader, and elevating him to a higher atmosphere. No doubt the volume sometimes expresses views which may impress some readers by their novelty and boldness. But it must be recollected that the object of most English commentaries is to minimize, or conceal, difficulties, and to lull the reader into a comfortable assurance that the traditional position is everywhere perfectly secure. The ordinary commentator so dreads the abuse



of criticism, that he refuses the use of it altogether; and his philological training is apt to be so imperfect that he cannot distinguish between what is mere arbitrary assertion and what rests upon a solid basis of fact. Moreover he is often deficient in that comprehensive and minute acquaintance with every part of the Hebrew Bible, without which even its shortest sections, even, for example, a single Psalm, do not appear in their proper perspective, and cannot in consequence be estimated aright. Professor Cheyne has the merit of being both outspoken and logical; and he brings to his subject a grasp not of the language merely, but, what is even of greater importance, of the ideas of the Old Testament, which enables him to present it in the most effective manner, and to suggest to the reader new and fruitful points of view. Even where we may hesitate to follow him implicitly in his conclusions, we are grateful for having the issue fairly stated, and a frank and honest endeavour made to meet it.

Prof. Cheyne's treatment of *Job* should be studied in connexion with the singularly powerful commentary on the same book by Prof. A. B. Davidson in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*. Each supplements the other in a welcome manner; the grounds, for instance, for some of Prof. Cheyne's conclusions being stated more cogently and completely in the Commentary.

In their general views of the date and place of composition of the Book of *Job*, the two professors are in substantial agreement. Against the Solomonic age, Prof. Cheyne urges justly (p. 72) "the more advanced stage of society, and greater maturity of the national intellect, presupposed on every page of the poem." Certainly, the argument from xv. 19, and even from xii. 17-19, will not be felt to be conclusive; but other considerations, taken collectively, possess weight, and the book will at least be scarcely *earlier* than the age of Jeremiah. Nor is it improbable that the home of the author was a locality E. or S.E. of Palestine (p. 75, 295). Inscriptions recently discovered have shown us that the neighbours of the Israelites spoke a language only dialectically differing from Hebrew, and that tribes farther to the south used an Aramaic dialect strongly tinged with Arabisms; by analogy, therefore, it is probable that the deviations from normal Hebrew, occurring in *Job*, are due to the fact that the author, while a genuine Israelite,<sup>1</sup> had his home in one of the border districts of Palestine, where the vocabulary was tinged by dialectic usage.

<sup>1</sup> Davidson, p. lvii.

On the structure of the book, Prof. Cheyne has a somewhat elaborate theory, though it is true it seems to be only offered tentatively as a view of "the *possible or probable* stages of its growth" (p. 66). It cannot indeed be reasonably doubted that the Elihu-speeches are a subsequent insertion—we are glad to observe the protest on p. 90 against the assumption that this view of their origin is an imputation against their "genuineness," and implies a disparagement of their value;—but whether the rest of the book was produced in successive stages as Prof. Cheyne supposes, may still, as it appears to us, be questioned. The purport of the speeches of Jehovah is justly indicated by Prof. Cheyne himself (p. 49 f.); on the Epilogue, it must suffice here to refer to Prof. Davidson's remarks (*Introd.*, p. xxxi., xxxiv. f.). The passages xxvii. 7–23 and xxviii., however, are a source of real difficulty. Each indeed is lucid enough in itself; but each (upon different grounds) is inappropriate in Job's mouth, and inconsistent with the position maintained by him, not before only, but subsequently. The difficulties are cogently stated by Prof. Davidson, pp. xxxv.–xl. and in the notes, pp. 189, 190, 201–2. German critics have spared no pains in the endeavour to establish a connexion: the passages have been made the subject of long and elaborate dissertations: the result is summed up by the last-named author in the discouraging sentence: "After all the efforts that have been made to relieve the difficulties of these two chapters, they still to a considerable extent remain" (p. xl). The fine monologue in which Job draws out the truth that absolute Wisdom belongs to the Creator, and to Him alone, practical religion ("the fear of the Lord") being the substitute appointed by Him for man, seems designed as a solution of the problem of the book; but, if so, it is unskillfully fitted in. The calm and submissive frame of mind in which Job here speaks is inconsistent with what follows, and especially leaves the ironical tone of the Divine speeches in chap. xxxviii., xxxix. unaccounted for. The difficulties which these two passages present must be admitted, though we can but speculate as to the causes to which they are due.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A few words may be permitted here with reference to xix. 26. No doubt the text of this verse is corrupt—certainly in clause *a* (נַקְפוּ זִמְתָּ), if not in clause *b*. Nevertheless we are unable to view the restoration proposed by Bickell as favourably as Prof. Cheyne appears to do. The exposition on p. 289 is indeed excellent; but can it be fairly extracted from Bickell's text, printed

The treatment of the Book of Proverbs is singularly happy. Well-chosen examples are selected; and they are admirably illustrated and discussed. The position occupied in Israel by the "wise men," and their importance as a class, is well brought out. The divisions in the Book of Proverbs are marked by the titles incorporated in the text. The original collection is obviously that extending from ix. 1 to xxii. 16. Chap. i.-ix., the "glorious little treatise" (p. 156) on the Praise of Wisdom, is generally admitted to be later than the principal collections of the book, and to have been prefixed to them as an Introduction. It is assigned by Prof. Cheyne, upon plausible grounds, to a date shortly prior to the Exile. The author's inspiring view of practical ethics as a branch of Divine wisdom, and the warm, affectionate tone in which his admonitions are couched, receive just appreciation at Prof. Cheyne's hands.

Of Ecclesiastes, Prof. Cheyne writes truly (p. 255): "Whichever way we look, whether to the social picture, or to the language, or to the ideas of the book, its recent origin forces itself upon us." The social state reflected in this remarkable book, its local colouring and tone, are well characterized by Dean Bradley in his luminous expositions, delivered in Westminster Abbey in 1884-5, and since published under the title *Lectures on Ecclesiastes*. Professor Cheyne, in agreement with Ewald and Delitzsch, assigns the book to the Persian period, though rightly and fairly admitting (p. 258) that "the evidence of the Hebrew favours a later date than that of Ewald,—favours, but does not actually require it." For he views with a well-founded scepticism the attempts that have been made to trace in it the definite presence of Greek philosophical ideas, and even to discover Græcisms in the language. The style of Ecclesiastes is indeed almost that of the Mishnah (2nd cent. A.D.), and it must be a product of the time when that style was in process of formation; but the alleged Græcisms do not appear to involve more than a normal and intelligible extension of native Hebrew usage. The two chapters devoted to

on p. 288? In *v. 26 a* the construction is incredibly harsh; not only is the *order* incorrect, but a verb is sadly desiderated. In *v. 26 b* the idiom is questionable ("to see from"?). In *v. 27* would not the contrast with *v. 26* need to be more clearly expressed? observe, the *tense* הוּזַח is the same in *26 b* and *27 a*. See further, on the passage, Prof. Davidson's note, and especially the Appendix, pp. 291-6. Prof. Cheyne, it is fair to add, allows Bickell's Hebrew to be "not easy."

“Ecclesiastes and its critics,” and the one on the “Textual Problems of Koheleth,” are discriminating and valuable. Naturally, the clever commentary of Dean Plumptre is one of those most highly commended.

Ecclesiastes, however, not less than Job, when treated as a whole, taxes severely the logical ingenuity of the critic. The author's theism is, indeed, untouched by his questionings; nevertheless, the book as a whole knows nothing of a future world, and the practical maxim which it lays down for life is a temperate and discreet enjoyment of the present, *without any accompanying reference to God* (p. 225). What, then, is to be done with iii. 17, xi. 9b, xii. 1a, 7b, 13, 14? If these passages allude to a judgment hereafter, they are not only at variance with the general tenor of the book, but are expressly contradicted by iii. 19-21 (R.V.). For there are not in reality “Two Voices” in Ecclesiastes. The author's aphorisms are no statement of the arguments for and against future retribution; nor is the higher faith (if it can be rightly so termed) of chapter xii. in any way the outcome of a previous train of reflection. It thus differs from the poem of Tennyson. In the poem there is a real debate; and the voice of doubt, having shown itself powerless in argument, is finally silenced by a particular observation of the poet. Making every allowance for the less artistic form of Ecclesiastes, had it been really the expression of a mental conflict, we should have expected the two sides to be more equably represented and more distinctly placed in opposition to one another. But this is not the case. The passages in question stand isolated. Prof. Cheyne has anticipated (p. 225) the objection to which the change in xii. 1, quoted (but not adopted) by him from Grätz, is likely to give rise: and we must frankly admit that we feel it. In Prov. v. 15-18 the figure is preserved throughout: is not the verb *Remember* here unsuitable to the metaphor supposed? Indeed, Prof. Cheyne owns (p. 226) that he wishes “some better remedy could be devised.” And (pp. 211, 234, 238-9, cf. p. 300) he in fact gives his preference to the view advocated chiefly by Luzzatto, according to which both this and the other verses referred to were additions made by an editor (see below) for the purpose of qualifying the too sustained scepticism of the book. This must be admitted to be a possible explanation; <sup>1</sup> certainly, in the case of xii. 1, a preferable alternative

<sup>1</sup> Compare the striking manner in which in the Targum to this book, a

to the desperate resort of Grätz. Is it however a necessary one? In the light of other passages, which Prof. Cheyne has not noticed in this connexion, it is difficult at least to feel confident that it is. In spite of the despondent thoughts which experience and the observation of life evoked in the author's heart, there is no hint that he is ever tempted to abandon his theistic faith: as Prof. Cheyne observes<sup>1</sup> (p. 201-2), he is not really a pessimist: he is conscious of a moral order in the world, and never loses his belief in a providential guidance of human affairs. Thus ii. 26 the man who is well pleasing before God *has* an advantage over the sinner; in v. 7 (Heb. 6) Qoheleth inculcates the fear of God—a fear which, though “cheerless,” is still “not an ineffectual” fear (*ib.* p. 217): vii. 18, 26, two other cases are mentioned in which the God-fearing man has an advantage over others. It is true, these passages do not imply a belief in future retribution; but there is no obligation to interpret the verses objected to in that sense. In iii. 17 even Delitzsch prefers the punctuation דַּשׁ *hath appointed* for דַּשׁ *there*. The verse will then be referred quite naturally to temporal judgments. xi. 9 may be interpreted similarly,—of course, without any alteration of the text. Is xii. 1, now, it may be asked, more than the application to a particular case of the belief expressed in ii. 26, and implied in the other passages quoted? If Qoheleth believes that, in spite of many disappointments and unredressed wrongs, the God-fearing man has still a comparative advantage over others, is there any inconsistency in his inculcating godliness? And xii. 7 expresses just the reversal of Gen. ii. 7. The question of the continued consciousness of the רוּחַ does not appear to be before the author.<sup>2</sup> xii. 13 f. may be actually (as Dean Plumptre also thinks) the words of the editor of Qoheleth, defining what he conceived to be the true moral of the book, and stating it in a fuller and more pointed form than had been done by the author himself.

The passages as regards which the decision is most difficult are, it will be seen, xi. 9*b* and xii. 1*a*. If the words in xi. 9*b* cannot

reference to a future life and retribution is repeatedly introduced—far more frequently than in any other Targum—as though similarly for the purpose of counteracting the sceptical inferences which the text might be supposed to warrant.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. also the remarks of Bickell in the Introduction to his little book on Qoheleth, *Der Prediger über den Wert des Daseins* (1884), p. 37-9.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. civ. 29, the רוּחַ of animals is “gathered in” by God at their death.



be reasonably interpreted except of a judgment hereafter, we are indeed almost compelled to follow Prof. Cheyne in holding them to be an addition made by the editor to the text of Ecclesiastes, similar in scope to xii. 14 (which they also resemble in expression). If future retribution had been a *certainty* to Qoheleth ("and *know* that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment") as it was, for instance, to the author of the Book of Wisdom, it seems impossible but that the allusions to it would have been more frequent and distinct, and indeed that the whole tenor of his writing would have been different. For (Cheyne, p. 231) "all is *not* 'vanity,'<sup>1</sup> if there is in human nature a point connecting a man with that world, most distant and yet most near, where in the highest sense God is." And, as regards xii. 1a, the exhortation, it must be owned, agrees imperfectly with the sequel, when viewed in the light thrown upon it by the entire book. The importance of beginning the service of God in youth, whether for its own sake, or before it is too late and a premature death renders it impossible, is not what the passage expresses. "What is the natural inference from the fact that at an advanced age life becomes physically a burden? Surely this—that man should enjoy life while his powers are fresh" (*ib.*, p. 225; comp. ii. 24, iii. 22, ix. 7, 9). And if the words, "And remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth," be treated as a subsequent insertion, this is the sense which the original text will have expressed. The omission does not injure the continuity of the passage: nor, if we may adopt the hypothesis proposed (*ib.*, p. 204) upon independent grounds, that the author's meditations were left by him in an unfinished state, and only published after his death, will the addition of such a clause by the editor imply on his part any unreasonable or extravagant liberty. It is, of course, not the *fact* that the author inculcates godliness, but the *manner* and *connexion* in which he inculcates it, that arouses suspicion of the integrity of the text. And the parallels referred to above, though they sufficiently justify the former, do not altogether explain the latter. The critic distrusts his own judgment. Perhaps, after all, we are too exacting in our demand upon Qoheleth for entire consistency, and the best possible form of expression. Or are we, on the

<sup>1</sup> The limitation of "all is vanity," in xii. 8, to man's earthly life, *as opposed to a higher life that is not vanity*, adopted by Delitzsch and Dean Plumptre, is arbitrary, and introduces a distinction of which the author does not show that he is conscious.



other hand, unconsciously influenced by sentiment, by a secret reluctance to disown Qoheleth's authorship of a familiar and impressive text? Let those who are satisfied that they possess a judgment free of bias resolve the uncertain issue.

But whatever may be the case with xi. 9 and xii. 1, the passages which have been referred to, viz. ii. 26, v. 7, vii. 18, 26, appear to us to constitute an ample defence of the Massoretic text of viii. 12 f. Bickell's restoration, adopted by Prof. Cheyne (p. 220) is, it is true, extremely clever, and gives a thought in agreement with the context; but it is violent;<sup>1</sup> nor, if it be true that the passage is not substantially more than a re-assertion of the conviction in a moral order expressed in the verses quoted, is it required.

The student acquainted with Hebrew, and interested in the comparison of the Massoretic text with the versions, will naturally not overlook the chapters on the text of the books discussed. The emendations proposed from time to time in the notes will nearly always repay careful consideration.

In conclusion, two or three *lapsus calami*, which may be a source of some confusion, may be corrected. P. 85, line 6 from bottom, for *reversed*, read *the same*; p. 86, line 4 of par. 2, for *Job*, read *Jeremiah*; p. 88, line 6 from bottom, omit *Lamentations* (see p. 86); p. 178, line 7, the name "Aben Ezra" should be enclosed in brackets; the commentary referred to is identical with one published by the present writer in 1880 from a MS. in the Bodleian Library (with which Horowitz was unacquainted) which it is clear from internal evidence cannot be the work of Aben Ezra; p. 175, on Almodad, the note of D. H. Müller (with whom Nöldeke and Dillmann [1886] agree), should be compared in Mühlau-Volek's Gesenius, ed. 9 (1883), p. 975; or ed. 10 (1886), *s.v.*

S. R. DRIVER.

<sup>1</sup> Is it moreover probable that an editor or scribe, having before him the words כי גם יודע אני אשר יהיה אשר חטא עשה רע מאז ומאריך לו ולא יאריך ימים האֱלֹהִים אִשֶׁר חֲטָא עֲשֵׂה רַע מֵאֵז וּמֵאֲרִיךְ לּוֹ כִּי גַם יוֹדַע אֲנִי אִשֶׁר יִהְיֶה אִשֶׁר חָטָא יִרְאֵה מִלִּפְנֵי אֱלֹהִים כִּי גַם יוֹדַע אֲנִי אִשֶׁר יִהְיֶה אִשֶׁר חָטָא עֲשֵׂה רַע מֵאֵז וּמֵאֲרִיךְ לּוֹ כִּי גַם יוֹדַע אֲנִי אִשֶׁר יִהְיֶה טוֹב לִירְאֵה האֱלֹהִים אִשֶׁר יִרְאֵה מִלִּפְנֵי וטוב לא יהיה לרשע ולא יאריך ימים כצל אשר

כי גם יודע אני? The retention of the identical words, כי גם יודע אני, in a different place, and *in a different sense*, strikes us as a suspicious element in the hypothesis.

## SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### IV. DIFFERENCES OF LANGUAGE MARKED.

1. THE representation of differences of expression in the original Greek, often subtle and yet significant, which had been neglected in the A.V. was no less important for the faithfulness of the Revision than the removal of differences which A.V. had introduced, or retained from the earlier Bibles. In endeavouring to satisfy this claim the Revisers had to face the difficult question of Greek synonyms (*Introd.* § 19); and if it was found impossible in some cases to convey to the English reader simply and sharply the shades of thought given by the original terms, yet, for the most part, his attention could be turned in the right direction. He would be aroused to seek for further light. A few illustrations from different classes of words will show how far success was attained in this respect.

2. Three verbs in Greek are rendered, and sometimes necessarily and not inadequately rendered, by the substantive verb *to be*; but they could not be interchanged in the original text without a distinct modification of the sense of the passages in which they occur. One of the words (*ὑπάρχειν*) is comparatively rare, and has no English equivalent.<sup>1</sup> The two others (*εἶναι, γίνεσθαι*), roughly represented by *to be* and *to become*, are very common.

<sup>1</sup> The verb is characteristic of the Pauline group of writings. Instructive examples of its use occur: Luke xi. 13, xvi. 14, 23, xxiii. 50; Acts ii. 30, iii. 2, iv. 34, viii. 16, xvii. 24; Rom. iv. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 7; Phil. ii. 6 marg., iii. 20 (2 Pet. iii. 11).

It was therefore necessary to consider, especially when these verbs stood in near connexion, whether their exact force could be suggested without a cumbrous paraphrase. Not unfrequently the problem was insoluble, or it appeared that the context sufficiently implied the idea of results reached (*e.g.* Luke xx. 14, *be ours*; Gal. iii. 24, *hath been our tutor*; Heb. ii. 17, *that He might be . . .*). In other cases the original Greek found a fair expression in English. Thus we read :

John xii. 36, *Believe on the light, that ye may become (not be) sons of light* (comp. i. 12).

Acts iv. 4, *The number of men came to be (not was) (comp. ii. 41) about five thousand.*

1 Cor. iii. 18, *If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become (by this very change, not be) wise.*

1 Cor. vii. 23, *Ye were bought with a price; become not (for be not) bondservants of men.*

2 Cor. iii. 7 f, *If the ministration of death . . . came with glory (not was glorious): . . . how shall not rather the ministration of the spirit be (the verb is changed) with glory?*

2 Tim. iii. 9, *Their folly shall be evident, . . . as theirs also came to be (not was).*

1 Pet. iv. 12, *The fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you.*

2 Pet. i. 4, . . . *that through these ye may become partakers of the Divine nature.*<sup>1</sup>

In all these examples the reader will perceive, with a little reflection, how much the words gain in living force by the distinct suggestion of progress, movement, change, which lies in the original word, and is now reflected in the R.V.

In the same way the question in the parable of the good

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Matt. xxiii. 26, xxiv. 32, xxvii. 24; John i. 6, viii. 58 marg.; Acts viii. 1, xv. 25; Heb. ii. 2, vi. 20; Rev. i. 18 marg., ii. 8 marg.

Samaritan receives fresh point by the more exact translation. *Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved (not was) neighbour unto him that fell among the robbers?* (Luke x. 36.) The point at issue was not the essential being, but the practical manifestation of character. The lesson of the progressive deterioration of the moral nature in the absence of the Divine Spirit is preserved in Matt. xii. 45 by the Revised rendering, *The last state of that man becometh (not is) worse than the first.*

3. In other passages the same form of rendering ("become") guards the expression of the great principle of a Divine counsel, a "law," fulfilled in the course of things, which had been obscured by the too specific translation ("is made") of A.V. Thus the Lord declares that He "came into the world" *that they which see may become (not be made) blind* (John ix. 39) by the action of forces already at work within them. And in the announcement of the central fact of the faith we feel the presence of an eternal purpose wrought out in Him when we read *the Word became flesh (for was made flesh)* (John i. 12); and again, *the first man Adam became a living soul: the last Adam became a life-giving spirit* (1 Cor. xv. 45).<sup>1</sup>

The importance of the thought thus indicated is seen in another connexion in 2 Cor. v. 21, where "being made" and "becoming" are set in contrast, though the difference was lost in A.V.: *Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become (not be made) the righteousness of God in Him.* The transformation of the believer follows from his vital union with God in Christ.

4. It was far more easy to suggest to the English reader the shades of thought represented by the different Greek words answering to "to be" than of those answering to "to know." Three words clearly distinct in conception (*εἰδέναι, γινώσκειν, ἐπίστασθαι*) are commonly, and for the most part

<sup>1</sup> See also Rom. vii. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 7 f; Heb. i. 4.

necessarily, so translated.<sup>1</sup> Of these, two are very common (*εἰδέναι*, *γινώσκειν*), one of which (*εἰδέναι*) describes, so to speak, a direct mental vision, knowledge which is at once immediate and complete; and the other (*γινώσκειν*) a knowledge which moves from point to point, springing out of observation and experience. The third word (*ἐπίστασθαι*) is much rarer, and expresses the knowledge which comes from close and familiar acquaintance. It will be evident that in many cases nothing but a paraphrase could convey the precise meaning of the original. Elsewhere the context gives the appropriate colour to the general term (*know*). In some places however it seemed desirable to mark the contrast when two of the words were placed in close connexion. Thus in John iii. 10, 11 there is a contrast between the absolute knowledge of the Lord and that power of recognising truth which an accredited master might be expected to possess; and thus R.V. gives, in strict conformity with the Greek, *Art thou the teacher of Israel, and understandest (A.V. knowest) not these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know. . . .* So again we see a little more of the meaning of the words by which the Lord replies to the impetuous question with which St. Peter met His offer of lowly service, when we read in R.V., *What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand (A.V. know) hereafter*, taught in the solemn school of apostolic work (John xiii. 7).<sup>2</sup> In one or two places the substitution of *learn* for *know* (*γινώσκειν*) adds to the narrative the touch of life which belongs to the progress of events; as when it is said, on the eve of the triumphal entry in Jerusalem, that *the common people of*

<sup>1</sup> A fourth word (*συνίεναι*), which expresses an intelligence of the meaning of that which is said and done, was generally and adequately rendered in A.V. by *understand*; and this rendering has been given in the two passages where it was otherwise translated, Mark vi. 52, 2 Cor. x. 12.

<sup>2</sup> It is, I think, to be regretted that the distinction was not made in Mark iv. 13; Heb. viii. 11; 1 John ii. 19. Comp. Acts xix. 15 marg.



the Jews learned (A.V. knew) *that [Jesus] was [at Bethany]* . . . (John xii. 9). The phrase suggests the idea of lively interest and inquiry, which prepare for what followed.<sup>1</sup> There is a similar vividness in the use of *perceive*; the disciples perceived (A.V. knew) *not the things that were said* when the Lord spoke of His passion (Luke xviii. 34); they could not read the signs before them.<sup>2</sup> The use of this word (*perceive*) of the Lord emphasises a trait in His perfect humanity. Looking on the anxious faces of the disciples He perceived (A.V. knew) *that they were desirous to ask Him* . . . (John xvi. 19).<sup>3</sup>

5. Sometimes, as we have already seen, a slight variation in language suggests a far-reaching thought. Life, for example, has a twofold aspect, the outward and the inward. We move in a visible order, and we move also in an invisible order. We have duties in regard to both. St. Paul fixes our attention on the truth by a significant change of verb in Rom. xii. 2, which has been represented in the R.V.: *Be not fashioned*, he says—"fashioned," that is, in your external character and bearing—*according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind* . . . in that which is essential and eternal. The difference which is thus indicated to the attentive student was happily preserved by A.V. in the important passage Phil. ii. 6, 8, *Christ Jesus being in the form of God . . . taking the form of a servant and being found in fashion as a man . . . humbled Himself* . . . And now it has been also marked in the remaining passages where the words are found: 2 Cor. xi. 13 ff; Phil. iii. 21.

6. There is again a most significant progress in man's opposition to the truth, which is greatly obscured in A.V. First comes the simple absence of belief (*οὐ πιστεύειν*); this

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Mark xv. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Mark xii. 12, xv. 10; Luke vii. 39, ix. 11; Acts xix. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Mark v. 30.



is followed by disbelief (*ἀπιστεῖν*); and at last disbelief issues practically in disobedience (*ἀπειθεῖν*). Thus we are able to follow a natural moral movement when we read in the record of the appearances of the risen Lord, that the disciples "disbelieved" the first tidings of Mary Magdalene, and "believed not" the later statements which came to them (Mark xvi. 11, 13). So also "disbelief," and not absence of belief, is the ground of men's condemnation (Mark xvi. 16; comp. Acts xxviii. 24); and the English reader can enter now more fully than before into the meaning of St. John's words when he reads, *He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not (not believeth not) the Son shall not see life* (John iii. 36). The same change gives a fresh touch to the portraiture of the adversaries of St. Paul at Ephesus, where, we now read, *some were hardened and disobedient* (A.V. believed not: Acts xix. 9; comp. Rom. xv. 31). These gainsayers of the truth felt the authority of the teaching which they opposed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Rom. xi. 30-32; Heb. iii. 18, iv. 6, 11, xi. 31.

One most important group of words, rendered in A.V. *repent, repentance* (*μετανοεῖν, μετάνοια, μεταμέλῃσθαι*), offered great difficulties in translation. The first two Greek words (*μετανοεῖν, μετάνοια*) describe characteristically in the language of the N.T. a general change of mind, which becomes in its fullest development an intellectual and moral regeneration; the latter (*μεταμέλῃσθαι*) expresses a special relation to the past, a feeling of regret for a particular action which may be deepened to remorse. It was of paramount importance to keep one rendering for the former words, which are key-words of the gospel, and it was impossible to displace *repent, repentance*, which, though originally inadequate, are capable of receiving the full meaning of the original. No one satisfactory term could be found for *μεταμέλῃσθαι*. In the passage where it occurs in the same context with *μετάνοια*, it has been adequately rendered by *regret* (2 Cor. vii. 8 ff); and elsewhere the limited application of the feeling has been indicated by the reflexive rendering *repent oneself* (never *repent* absolutely): Matt. xxi. 29, 32, xxvii. 3; Heb. vii. 21. Yet *without repentance* (*ἀμεταμέλητος*), Rom. xi. 29, is unchanged. Dr. T. Walden has expounded the apostolic force of *μετάνοια* with great power and truth in an essay on *The Great Meaning of the word Metanoia, lost in the Old Version, unrecovered in the New* (New York, 1882); but he has overlooked the fact that the idea of *repentance*, like that of *μετάνοια* itself, can be transfigured by Christian use, and that the force of words is not limited by their etymology.

7. In these examples we can see how the R.V. has accurately preserved traits in man's attitude of opposition to God. It has also carefully distinguished the two distinct forms in which the apostolic writers have presented our filial connexion with Him. There is the position of "sonship" (characteristic of the teaching of St. Paul), which suggests the thoughts of privilege, of inheritance, of dignity; and there is also the position of "childship" (characteristic of the teaching of St. John), which suggests the thoughts of community of nature, of dependence, of tender relationship. Sons may be adopted; children can only be born. The two conceptions are evidently complementary; but they must be realised separately before the full force of the whole idea which they combine to give can be felt. The English reader has now, for the first time, the materials for the work. Yet even here it was felt to be impossible to change the phrase, "the children of Israel," for "the sons of Israel," though the exact phrase has a clear significance (contrast 1 Pet. iii. 6). With this exception (and one accidental omission of the mark of reference in Matt. xxi. 28 1°), I believe that the use of "child" ("children") is always marked in the R.V.; and that with the clearest gain to the natural feeling of the narrative (Mark ii. 5; Matt. ix. 2; Luke xv. 31, xvi. 25; Matt. xxi. 28) and address (1 Cor. iv. 14; 1 Tim. i. 2, 28; Tit. i. 4, etc.), no less than to the exact definition of spiritual relations. On the other hand, the grand title, "sons of God," holds its true place, according to the exact usage of the original.

Two or three illustrations will be sufficient to indicate the gain to the student of Scripture from the faithful preservation of this distinction between the general conceptions of a Divine inheritance and a Divine nature. Thus we now read that the Lord gave to them that received Him *the right to become children* (A.V. sons) *of God, which were*

born . . . of God (John i. 12). And again: *Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children (A.V. the sons) of God: and such we are* (1 John iii. 1 f). So, conversely, in other places the title of privilege is restored to the English text. *They that are accounted worthy to attain to that world . . . are equal unto the angels, and are sons (A.V. the children) of God, being sons of the resurrection* (Luke xx. 35). *Where it was said unto them, Ye are not My people, there shall they be called sons (A.V. the children) of the living God* (Rom. ix. 26).<sup>1</sup>

8. If we carry our thoughts still further to that unseen and future order, of which with our present powers we can form no definite conception, we find the R.V. has distinguished between *hell* (*γέεννα*), the place of suffering, and *hades*, the place of spirits (the unbounded, *sheol*) (see Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xvi. 23; Acts ii. 27; Rev. i. 18). It has also adequately presented the most characteristic claim of the gospel, which was obliterated before, in the familiar phrase that Christ *brought life and immortality to light through the gospel* (2 Tim. i. 10, A.V.); whereas we now read that He *brought life and incorruption to light*. The revelation of the resurrection is *incorruption* (*ἀφθαρσία*), the preservation of all that belongs to the fulness of humanity (comp. Rom. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 54, A.V.), and not simple continuance of being. Immortality (*ἀθανασία*) is a separate idea (1 Cor. xv. 53 f; 1 Tim. vi. 16), which falls far short of the completeness of assurance which comes through the revelation of the risen Lord.

9. The importance of preserving an unusual phrase may be shown by an example of a different kind, where a peculiar word gives the clue to the understanding of the real course of apostolic thought. One of the most decisive steps

<sup>1</sup> Compare Matt. v. 9, 45; Luke vi. 35; Gal. iii. 26. See also Exod. xiii. 13, 15 (R.V.).

in the historic interpretation of the work and person of Christ was the perception that in Him was fulfilled the prophecy of the "servant of the Lord" (*παῖς Κυρίου*, Isa. lii. ff), which fact is clearly marked in the early chapters of the Acts. In the A.V. the fact was wholly hidden by the adoption of the translation "child" or "son" for "servant" (Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30). Now the careful reader cannot fail to observe how the meaning of Isaiah's teaching was brought home by the Spirit to the Apostles, and through this the real significance of the sufferings of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

10. So far the illustrations have been taken from words which are of frequent occurrence. In the A.V. of Rom. iii. 25 the confusion of a word, which is found there only in the N.T. (*πάρεσις*), with another common word from the same root (*ἄφεσις*) has led to the complete inversion of St. Paul's meaning. The sins of former time were neither forgiven nor punished: they were simply passed over; and for this reason there was need of the vindication of the righteousness of God, *because of the passing over of the sins done aforesaid, in the forbearance of God*, and not (as A.V.) *for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God*. The distinction between the unique words *divinity* (*θείότης*, Rom. i. 20) and *Godhead* (*deity*, *θεότης*, Col. ii. 9) is not less important.<sup>2</sup> And under this head reference may be made to the care taken by the Revisers to represent words of a single occurrence in the original by words of single occurrence in the English version. A considerable number of the novelties of language are due to this necessary endeavour; and a student who has the patience to work through the following examples will gain a new sense of the richness of the apostolic vocabulary, which has been hidden in A.V.<sup>3</sup> *Apparition* (*φάν-*

<sup>1</sup> Compare Luke i. 54 (Israel), i. 69; Acts iv. 25 (David). See also Matt. xii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Acts xvii. 29 marg. (*τὸ θεῖον*).

<sup>3</sup> The words quoted occur, I believe, in the Greek and English texts of the

τασμα, Matt. xiv. 26, Luke vi. 49); *awe* (δέος, Heb. xii. 28); *billows* (σάλος, Luke xxi. 25); *concealed* (παρακαλύπτεσθαι, Luke ix. 45); *conduct* (ἀγωγή, 2 Tim. iii. 10); *confute* (διακατελέγεσθαι, Acts xviii. 28); *demeanour* (κατάστημα, Tit. ii. 3); *discipline* (σωφρονισμός, 2 Tim. i. 7); *disrepute* (ἀπελεγμός, Acts xix. 27); *effulgence* (ἀπαύγασμα, Heb. i. 3); *goal* (σκοπός, Phil. iii. 14); *impostor* (γοῆς, 2 Tim. iii. 13); *to interpose* (μεσιτεύειν, Heb. vi. 17); *Justice* (ἡ Δίκη, Acts xxviii. 4); *to moor* (προσορμίζεσθαι, Mark vi. 53); *sacred* (ιέρως, 1 Cor. ix. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 15); *to shudder* (φρίσσειν, Jas. ii. 19); *stupor* (κατάνυξις, Rom. xi. 8); *to train* (σωφρονίζειν, Tit. ii. 4); *tranquil* (ἡρεμος, 1 Tim. ii. 2); *undressed* (ἄγναφος, Matt. ix. 16, Mark ii. 21); *without self-control* (ἀκρατής, 2 Tim. iii. 3).

11. A variation in the use of prepositions often suggests instructive lines of thought. A good illustration of such significant differences of expression lost in A.V. is supplied by a passage to which we have already referred for examples of differences introduced into A.V. which have no place in the original (1 Cor. xii. 4 ff). Here in the description of the manifestation of the Spirit we read in A.V., *To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit.* Thus “the word of wisdom,” “the word of knowledge,” and “faith” are presented in exactly the same connexion with the Spirit, as simply given “by” Him. But in the original three different prepositions are used to describe the relation of these three gifts to the Spirit, represented exactly in the R.V. by “*through* the Spirit,” “*according to* the Spirit,” “*in* the Spirit” (Vulgate, *per, secundum, in*). The English reader is necessarily led to consider whether this unexpected variation does not throw

N.T. only in the places quoted; and the new English words cannot fairly be said to be inharmonious with the old. In making the list I have found great help from Messrs. Bemrose & Sons' excellent *Student's Concordance to the New Testament* (R.V.). London [1884].



some light upon the gifts themselves. Even if he finds no answer to the question at once, it will be something to have proposed it. He will at least be led to reflect on the difference between "wisdom" and "knowledge." He will feel perhaps that "wisdom" is absolute, unchangeable, belonging to things eternal; that "knowledge" is progressive, "growing from more to more." If this be so, he will understand that, in the one case, the Spirit is, as it were, the speaker of the word in the soul; that, in the other case, He is the guide who directs and rules and regulates the observation which finds expression through man. And when he has realised this twofold action of the Spirit, he will be prepared to consider that there is yet a third relation in which we may stand to Him. We may be, as it were, lost in Him, enwrapped in His transfiguring influence. Then the faith which wields the powers of the world to come has its scope. Now even if this particular interpretation be faulty or imperfect, still it will not have been without use that the English reader has been constrained, as the Greek reader, to take account of the manifold action no less than of the manifold gifts of the Spirit.

12. It is easy to multiply instances of other shades of thought conveyed by variation in construction which are neglected by A.V. For example, the key to the understanding of the tragic record in John viii., the crisis in the development of Jewish unbelief, lies in the change of phrase in *vv.* 30, 31. As the Lord spoke *many believed on Him* (*ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν*), with the devotion of perfect self-surrender; but there were others, "Jews" in the technical language of the evangelist, who *believed Him* (*πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ*), who acknowledged the truth of His statements, and the justice of His claim to Messiahship, but would have made Him the Messiah of their own hearts, and by the force of that prepossession were prepared for fatal unbelief.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare John iv. 21, 39; xiv. 11, 12; v. 24, 38, 46 f.



The difference in the view of the destiny of Christian ministrations marked in R.V. of Eph. iv. 12 is less striking at first sight, but it will repay consideration. The Divine gifts, as we now read, are made *for* (*πρός*) *the perfecting of the saints, unto* (*εἰς*) *the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ.* Our conception of the Divine word is made clearer when we distinguish the first Author of the message from the prophet who delivers it. The word is spoken *by* (*ὑπό*) God, and *through* (*διά*) His messenger (Matt. i. 22, xxi. 4, xxii. 31).<sup>1</sup> So again there is a difference in the conception of spiritual activities where they are referred to an origin regarded as apart (*ἀπό*), or to a source from which they flow as in continuous connexion with it (*ἐξ*), or as belonging to the agent (*γεν.*). It is indeed most difficult to do more than suggest to the English student a subject for reflection, but this is the effect of the Greek upon the reader of the original (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 5, iv. 7).<sup>2</sup>

13. It may be objected that there is something of over-refinement in the distinctions which have been just noticed. No such charge lies against the distinction of separate and yet related words in the same context. The book of the Revelation furnishes good illustrations of the loss or confusion which has arisen from the neglect of this obvious duty of a translator. One main thought of the book is the conflict between the brute forces of earthly empire and the spiritual force of the risen Saviour. According to the imagery of the Old Testament there is on the one side "one like to a Son of man" (i. 13, xiv. 14); and on the other "a seven-headed beast (xi. 7 ff), which becomes the organ of the false spirit. So far the picture is clear; but

<sup>1</sup> Compare John i. 3, 10, 17; Acts ii. 43, xii. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Not unfrequently it is impossible to convey the impression of the original, even where the thought involved is of importance (John xvi. 27, 28, 30, *παρά, ἐξ, ἀπό*; i. 1, *πρός*).

it is strangely disturbed when the same name "beast" is applied to the four "living creatures" before the throne which render to God the unceasing homage of creation (iv. 6 ff, v. 6, vi. 1 ff, xiv. 3, xv. 7, xix. 4). The reader misses the pregnant contrast between the world as God made it and as it is still so far as it remains in fellowship with Him, and the world as it is in isolated self-assertion opposed to Him.

We have already noticed how seriously the two renderings of "throne" mar the representation of the conflict of good and evil in the Apocalypse (III. § 12). The rendering of two words by the one word "crown" has not been less injurious in another aspect. The common word for crown (*στέφανος*)—the significant name of the first martyr—suggested to the Greek reader simply the victor's wreath. This is the thought of "the crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10; comp. iii. 11), "the incorruptible crown" (1 Cor. ix. 25), "the crown of righteousness" (2 Tim. iv. 8), "the crown of glory that fadeth not away" (1 Pet. v. 4), "the crown of gold" of the elders (Rev. iv. 4, 10), the crown of the great Conqueror (vi. 2), and the very crown of thorns, the victor's wreath of "the Man of sorrows." But in contrast with this there is the "diadem"—the fillet of the Persian king—the symbol of sovereign dignity. The word is found in the N.T. only in the Apocalypse. It occurs three times, and in each case its force is unmistakable. The great dragon had "upon his head seven diadems" (Rev. xii. 3). The ten-horned beast had "on his horns ten diadems" (Rev. xiii. 1). And then, in significant contrast with this unholy and usurped dominion, when the Word of God is revealed in His Majesty, bearing His Name as "King of kings and Lord of lords," He has "upon His head many diadems" (Rev. xix. 12), bearing sway not in one order only but in many.

14. In these cases the distinction of the synonymes

belongs to the right understanding of the imagery of the whole book. Elsewhere it affects the full meaning of the particular passage, and the importance of distinguishing the related words becomes even more apparent when they are found in the same context. Probably the most striking illustration of the harm which may follow from the neglect of this consideration is furnished by John x. 16, where the whole character of the Lord's promise has been obscured by the unhappy rendering of two perfectly distinct Greek words by "fold." The R.V. has now restored the rendering of Tyndale and Coverdale, and we read: *Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice; and they shall become one flock* (A.V. fold), *one shepherd* (Ezek. xxxiv. 23).

The false rendering came from the Latin Vulgate, and the phrase "one fold, one shepherd" had probably been made familiar in English by Wiclif. But the old Latin, like the other ancient versions, marked the difference, which is clear in the original; and it would be difficult to over-rate the evil influence which the confusion of the "fold" and the "flock" has exercised on popular theology. Elsewhere the great lesson of the corporate union of the Church is taught, but here the thought is of the spring of unity in personal relationship with Christ.

15. The example which has been given is of exceptional interest. The force of the correction is felt at once. In other cases the gain of exactness is less conspicuous, and yet of real moment. This will be seen from a few representative passages, which shew the general character of the changes made in order to distinguish synonymes in close connexion.

Matt. xxvi. 55, xxvii. 15: Jesus said, *I sat daily in the temple teaching, and ye took me not. . . . Judas cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary* (A.V. temple), *and departed*. The distinction between the temple with its

courts (*ἱερόν*) and the sanctuary, the dwelling-place of God (*ναός*), is essential to the understanding of the outward ritual of Judaism, and of its spiritual counterpart. The temple (*ἱερόν*) has no place in the Apocalypse. The sanctuary (*ναός*) is the image of the body of Christ and of Christians (John ii. 19, 21; 1 Cor. iii. 16 f, vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21), and in all these places the attention of the reader is called to the exact word by a marginal note.

Luke ix. 24: *Whosoever would (A.V. will) save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall (A.V. will) lose his life for My sake, the same shall save it.* The difference between the desire of saving (*ὅς ἂν θέλῃ σῶσαι*) and the fact of losing (*ὅς ἂν ἀπολέσῃ*) is entirely lost in A.V., though it is obviously required for the meaning of the passage.

John i. 11: *He came unto His own (τὰ ἴδια), and they that were His own (οἱ ἴδιοι; A.V. and His own) received Him not.* The separate mention of the "holy land" and "holy people" applies to the word that which is said of Jehovah in the Old Testament with singular fulness.

John vi. 10: *Jesus said, Make the people (τοὺς ἀνθρώπους A.V. the men) sit down. . . . So the men (οἱ ἄνδρες) sat down, in number about five thousand.* The change of word calls up at once the additional clause in St. Matthew (xiv. 21).

Acts iv. 27, 28: *Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples (λαοῖς) of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel fore-ordained to come to pass (γενέσθαι; A.V. to be done).* The variation of expression illustrates what has been already said in § 2.

1 Cor. xiv. 20: *Brethren, be not children (παιδιά) in mind: howbeit in malice be ye babes (νηπιάζετε; A.V. be ye children), but in mind be men.* The literal translation of the verb (*νηπιάζειν*), which occurs here only in the New Testament

brings out the climax of the thought (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 1 ; Heb. v. 13).

Heb. iv. 9 f: *There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest (σαββατισμός; A.V. rest) for the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest (κατάπαυσις) hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from His.* The peculiar word significantly connects the character of the promised rest of man with that of the rest of God.

1 Pet. v. 7:  *Casting all your anxiety (μέριμνα; A.V. care) upon Him, because He careth (μέλει) for you.*<sup>1</sup>

16. Sometimes the exact rendering of connected words removes that which is embarrassing in the text of A.V. Thoughtful readers of the English Testament must often have been perplexed by the apparent discrepancy between the two sayings as to the Baptist in John i. 8, v. 35, which now are brought into a most significant harmony. *He was not the light: He was the lamp that burneth and shineth, kindled from another source, and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.*<sup>2</sup> There is again, to take a different kind of illustration, an unmeaning harshness in the words, *he that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet*, which is at once removed when we know that there

<sup>1</sup> Other instructive examples will be found in Matt. iv. 19 ff. (*come ye after Me, followed*); v. 17 f. (*fulfil, accomplished*); Mark v. 40 ff. (*child, damsel*); Luke xii. 3 (*said, spoken*); xiv. 12 f. (*call, bid*); xvii. 26 (*come to pass, be*); John viii. 49, 54 (*honour, glorify*); xvi. 16 (*behold, see*); xvii. 12 (*kept, guarded*); xx. 5 f. (*seeth, beholdeth*); xxi. 15 f. (*feed, find*); Acts i. 2, 9 (*received up, taken up*); iii. 2, 10 (*door, gate*); vii. 13 (*made known, became manifest*); viii. 20 (*silver, money*); Rom. xiii. 2 (*resisteth, withstandeth*); 1 Cor. x. 16 f. (*partake of, have communion with*); xi. 30 (*many, not a few*); xi. 31 (*discerned, judged*); xiv. 7 (*voice, sound*); xiv. 36 (*went, came*); 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6 (*dawn, shine*); Gal. i. 6 f. (*a different, another*); iii. 15, 17 (*maketh void, disannul*); Phil. iv. 17 f. (*increaseth, abound*); Col. iii. 23 (*do, work*); 1 Thess. ii. 13 (*received, accepted*); 1 Tim. iii. 1 (*seeketh, desireth*); 2 Tim. iv. 16 f. (*took my part, stood by me*); Heb. i. 11 (*minister, do service*); xii. 26 (*shake, make to tremble*); Jas. i. 17 (*gift, boon*). Even when the English rendering is inadequate the reader is led to seek for completer help.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Matt. vi. 22, *The lamp of the body is the eye* (Luke xi. 33 ff); 2 Pet. i. 19, *The word of prophecy . . . a lamp shining in a dark place*; Rev. xxi. 23, *The glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof was the Lamb.*



is a contrast in the original between the washing of the whole body and the washing of some small part: *he that is bathed* (ὁ λελουμένος) *needeth not save to wash* (νίψασθαι) *his feet* (John xiii. 10), just as the guest who rests in the evening after his day's journey (1 Tim. v. 10).<sup>1</sup> Stress is often laid upon a supposed change in St. Paul's opinions as to the coming of the Lord. A reader of A.V. would naturally suppose that he had a conclusive proof of the fact, whatever use he might make of it, in a comparison of 2 Thess. ii. 2, *be not . . . troubled . . . by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand*, with Rom. xiii. 12, *The night is far spent, the day is at hand*. The R.V. now marks the peculiar word in the former passage (ἐνέστηκεν, not ἤγγικεν), *as that the day of the Lord is now present*, and points to the false opinion involved (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 18). The rendering in Luke xxiv. 25, *O foolish men* (ἀνόητοι) *and slow of heart to believe . . .* is no doubt less vigorous than *O fools, and slow of heart to believe . . .*; but the English reader will be glad to know that the Lord does not apply to the disciples the condemnation of Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 17, *μωροί*).

17. It happens not unfrequently that no simple rendering can represent the distinctions between synonymes conveyed by the original. In such cases, where there seemed to be a likelihood of misunderstanding, a marginal note directs the attention of the reader to the shade of meaning of which he must take account. For example, our English word "world" has to do duty for three Greek words most distinct in meaning. Most commonly "world" stands for a word (κόσμος) which has been naturalised in modern English as *cosmos*. This presents the thought of the whole sum of finite being as apart from God, and specially it

<sup>1</sup> For "bathed" compare Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5. It is to be regretted, I think, that "bathed" was not substituted for "washed" in Heb. x. 22 (Exod. xxix. 4; Lev. xvi. 4).



describes all that falls under our observation which is actually estranged from God. Again, "world" answers to a plural or singular, "the ages," or "the age" (*οἱ αἰῶνες, ὁ αἰὼν*), in which creation is regarded as a vast system unfolded from æon to æon, as an immeasurable and orderly development of being under the condition of time, of which each "age," or "this age" and "the age to come," has its distinguishing characteristics, and so far is "the world." And, thirdly the "world" renders a term (*ἡ οἰκουμένη*) which describes the seat of settled government and civilised life, practically conterminous with the Roman Empire. The occurrence of the two latter forms in the original is marked by the margins "ages" or "age" and "the inhabited earth." (See Heb. i. 2, vi. 5 text, ix. 26, xi. 3; Matt. xii. 32, xiii. 22, 39, etc.; Heb. i. 6, ii. 5; Matt. xxix. 14; Luke ii. 1.) In like manner "devil" has been retained as the translation of three words (*διάβολος, δαίμων, δαιμόνιον*); but a margin (Gk. *demon*) is added when either of the two latter words is so rendered. Elsewhere a marginal note calls attention to the occurrence of an unusual word (*καταφιλεῖν*, Matt. xxvi. 48, Luke vii. 45), or to a difference of moment, either for the interpretation of the passage (*δοῦλος, διάκονος*, Matt. xxii. 1 ff, Mark x. 43 f; *φιλεῖν, ἀγαπᾶν*, John xxi. 16; *κλαίειν, δακρῦειν*, John xi. 31, 33, 35), or for the identification of the incident (*κόφινος, σφυρίς*, Matt. xvi. 9, Mark viii. 19).

18. We may conclude with an example of a different kind which is found in Gal. vi. 2, 5, where we read in close sequence, *Bear ye one another's burdens*, and . . . *every man shall bear his own burden*. But we are now informed that "burden" represents two Greek words (*βάρος, φόρτος*), and that in the second case many think the rendering "load" preferable. In any case the English reader is guided to a true discernment of that which sympathy can and cannot do. It is indeed most true that

we must all support that which God assigns to us, but friendship can lighten the weight of that which we are required to bear.

B. F. WESTCOTT.

---

HOMILETICAL FEATURES OF THE EPISTLE TO  
THE ROMANS.

IT is not from the brief notes of his sermons in the Acts that we get our best idea of the preaching powers of St. Paul. Some of his epistles are emphatically sermons, the words of a living man to living men, obviously written with a most vivid sense of his audience, aglow with the inspiration which a sympathetic audience brings, and dealing with men at close quarters, as only impassioned preachers can. The Epistle to the Romans is by far the best example of these qualities. It does not exhibit such a death struggle as the Epistle to the Galatians; it is not so much preaching *à outrance*, as was said of the sermons of Bossuet; but it presents a more thorough combination of the various properties that make up a highly effective discourse. It is in most respects what the Apostle would have preached at Rome if he had had an hour to spend with the Christians there. It is of course much more closely packed than would have been suitable in any ordinary sermon. But in this respect it is only the counterpart of the Sermon on the Mount. Its concentration does not hinder it, any more than it hinders the Sermon on the Mount, from reflecting the great homiletical features of its author's mind. It is directed to the two great objects of homiletical discourse—instruction and persuasion; and these two objects are prosecuted in the proportions suitable to a sermon. First addressing himself to the intellect of his audience, the

Apostle passes on to rouse up their springs of action, and presses on these with the skill and the vigour of a master. Grand though his expositions of truth are, he is not satisfied with expounding, his great aim is to persuade. He does not huddle up the persuasive part in a few general remarks, or a formal exhortation at the close. All through the epistle he keeps it in view, but here and there he bends his whole powers to the business, determined to leave to his hearers no loophole of escape.

The introduction serves the double purpose for which this part of a discourse is designed ; it excites interest, and it throws light on the subject which is to be discussed. It is based on the Apostle's personal relation to the Roman Church, and it exemplifies the bright, cheerful spirit in which he usually wrote, and probably also spoke ; it brings before us the wistful expression, the look of manly interest and affection which he would cast on his congregation when he began to address them. The personal consideration was, that he felt himself to be in their debt ; people prick up their ears when a preacher tells them he comes to them to discharge a debt. And this in Paul's case was no unmeaning catchword. It was his profound conviction that, through the mischief which he did in his unconverted youth, he was debtor both to Greeks and barbarians, both to wise and foolish, for he had laboured then to tear the blessed gospel from them. That debt could be cancelled only by unusual earnestness now in preaching that gospel to them in all its richness and glory, and pressing it on their personal acceptance. It was a most glorious subject, and a most precious boon ; for the gospel of Jesus Christ was the power of God unto salvation to every one that believed, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. It was a blessing for the whole world, and by far the most glorious gift of Heaven.

He then proceeds at once to business ; following a plan

which, though not announced beforehand, is clear, simple, and comprehensive. That plan is, 1st, to show that all men need the gospel, Jew and Gentile alike; 2nd, to unfold the provisions of the gospel, first for pardoning, and then for purifying; 3rd, to make some explanation respecting points of difficulty that have arisen in the previous discussion; and, 4th, to make an ethical application of the whole. In the last few chapters of the epistle the character of a letter predominates; he speaks to his correspondents in a plain, easy way of some things that he would have them attend to; while in the last chapter of all we find a peculiarly interesting feature of a letter—personal remembrances and salutations to many of the good people at Rome, whose devotion to Christian work was most refreshing to his soul.

What may be called the sermon proper is confined to the first twelve chapters. Taking a general survey of this part in a homiletical point of view, the feature that at the first glance strikes us most is the great variety of level which it presents. It brings up to us an Alpine scene, with a remarkable combination of precipitous paths, dark gorges, and smiling valleys. Our guide is equally at home in them all. He has little mercy on us as regards the necessity for violent intellectual exercise; it needs a very hard pull to follow him up those craggy heights of argument, and through the objections that bristle like *chevaux de frise* against his course; but he is very considerate for us, inasmuch as, after every hard struggle, he leads us to some quiet resting-place, where we lie down to recover our breath, till, being rested, we are summoned anew to a higher climb. This succession of periods of tremendous mental effort and calm repose is one of the most notable features of the writing. Thus, after following him through his elaborate proof in the first three chapters of the sinfulness of man, we lie down beside green pastures and still waters

at chapter iii. 24, to enjoy the beautiful picture of redemption, "being justified freely by His grace." Then after a severe logical proof in chapter iv. of God's way of justification, we are invited to rest, and to look out calmly on the glorious privileges of salvation by grace (chap. v. 1)—"we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." After further intellectual exercise, as we follow his proof of the way of sanctification by grace, we enter that delightful arbour, the eighth chapter, the central gem of the epistle, of which it has been said so well that it begins with no condemnation, and ends with no separation. But as soon as we quit that charming arbour we are summoned to a harder and stiffer climb than ever—the discussions of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters. At the top of the climb another grove of Elim awaits us, with its palm trees and refreshing wells, in the glorious vision of a restored Israel and a completed kingdom of God, drawing from our ravished hearts the exclamation, "Oh the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!" Then we are summoned to a different exercise, to grapple with the high duties and graces of the Christian life; but after so rich an exposition of Christian privilege there is no sense of incongruity in the exalted standard of Christian duty which he imposes, even though he enjoins us, if our enemy hunger to feed him, and if he thirst to give him drink.

There can be little doubt that it is the sweet passages of complacent enjoyment, rather than the stiff passages of argument preceding them, that to most readers form the charm of the Epistle to the Romans. Indeed, if they were to confess the truth, many, but not all, would call the arguments somewhat hard and dry. But the argumentative parts are to the meditative as the granite chains in an Alpine country to the beauty that smiles in the valley below. The one could not exist without the other. The combination of



the two is the triumph of homiletical skill. One will sometimes hear logical discourses of great power, fitted to make a great impression on trained intellects; but if they are all in one key, on one level, the attention even of the best trained intellects is somewhat strained, and others are unable to attend at all. On the other hand, one will sometimes hear emotional discourses, bringing out very sweetly the joys and glories of redemption; but the quality is too soft and sweet, as if a feast should consist of the sweet course only. Very different from either is the Apostle's discourse. He knows how to mingle all the ingredients of interest and instruction; he knows how to work on all the faculties of the human soul. Like a musician who is master of his instrument, he knows how to evoke every chord. Now he deals with the reason, challenging it to receive the truths so clearly established; now he appeals to the conscience, evoking its witness against its very owner; anon he refreshes the whole soul with the consolations of the gospel; yet again he evokes the imagination, especially to dwell on the glory yet to be revealed. This, we say, is the triumph of the homiletical art. No good preacher will be content with a monotonous level; he will mingle intervals of repose with periods of exertion, and enliven the grave utterances of the reason with the livelier touches of feeling and fancy.

So much for the most outstanding homiletical feature of the epistle. We now advance to point out some of the minuter features to which it owes much of its impressiveness.

We do not dwell here on what has been so often pointed out—the abrupt and sometimes involved and elliptical character of the Apostle's logical processes. Some one has compared his mind so full of his subject to a bottle full of water, from which, when it is inverted, the water issues in irregular gushes, not in a flowing stream. He was one of those busy men whose lives are spent at high pressure, and



under the influence of this high pressure most of his epistles were written. If this impaired his logic, it increased his power; it gave to his letters a rush and momentum which cannot be attained by the leisurely writer. It were well for those who carp at his logic if they could rival the intensity and the glow with which he pours out his soul, and which serve so well to kindle the souls of his hearers into corresponding fervour.

Nor is it necessary to dwell on the manifestly Hebraistic structure of some of his arguments. His reasonings on the law, in the Romans and elsewhere, could have fallen in full force only on Jewish minds. We may, with some care, be able to spell out the meaning; but they come to us with the disadvantage of a translation compared with an original writing. Even when writing to the Romans it was obviously Jews whom he had chiefly in view (see ii. 17, iii. 9, iv. 1, vii. 1, etc.). At one place (xi. 13) he limits his remark to Gentiles, but this is an exception to the ordinary tenor of the epistle.

It is of more importance practically to point out some of the features by which he relieves and brightens his processes of logic.

1. Among these we note his habit of putting questions. The point of interrogation is more in demand in printing the Romans than (in proportion to its size) in any other book of the Bible. In the first twelve chapters (if we have counted correctly) there are no fewer than eighty-three questions; and, for the most part, it is in the argumentative portions that they occur. They are useful in a course of argument in keeping up attention, for a question fitly put always sets a hearer's mind in motion; without such a device attention might flag, and the effect of the argument might be lost. The Apostle's argument may be sometimes intricate, but his mode of arguing is never dull.

2. A similar purpose is served—the quickening of atten-

tion—by his frequent use of familiar Old Testament incidents. In the compass of the epistle there occur thirty-two quotations from the Old Testament, and upwards of twenty other allusions to matters connected with the Jews. As we have already remarked, it was the Jews who were mainly in his mind in writing the epistle. Such quotations and references to what must have been familiar to them quickened attention while they confirmed the argument; analogies are always stimulating, especially when by means of them light is thrown from the familiar to the unfamiliar, from the obvious to the obscure.

3. A more characteristic and interesting feature is the occasional out-flashing of beautiful gems of thought in the very midst of somewhat intricate discussions. This is a fruit of genius, and is more easy to admire than to imitate. A hard argument is brightened by a wonderful spiritual coruscation, as at night a dark sky is relieved by the flash of a lighthouse. Thus the somewhat gloomy picture of the law magnifying and multiplying our offences is suddenly brightened by the out-flashing of the truth, "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." The despair which hovers so near him in his discussion of indwelling sin is scattered by the blessed thanksgiving, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." The dreary spectacle of Israel falling away, and their table becoming a snare and a trap and a stumblingblock, is gloriously relieved by a ray of comfort flashed on the sad present from the glorious future, "If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?"

Perhaps we may find in other epistles even finer instances of this practice. In 1 Corinthians vii. occurs a prolonged discussion on questions of casuistry relating to marriage. The point of view is suddenly changed, a trumpet note falls on the ear, and we find ourselves in the midst of the

most stirring realities of life and death: "This I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not: for the fashion of this world passeth away." Very striking too, in Galatians ii., after a discussion on the law and the relations of the believer to it, is that glowing picture of the spiritual life: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." In the same epistle (chap. iv.) when the matter under discussion is the bondage or pupillage of the Jewish economy, there breaks in like a sunbeam the glorious truth, "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." That "gem of purest ray serene," the description of charity in 1 Corinthians xiii., comes in during a discussion of "the gifts"—healing, prophesying, tongues, interpretations, and the like: transitory topics that have lost much of their interest for other times and other Churches; suddenly we come on that incomparable picture, of which we may say, as of its great subject, that it "never faileth." It is a proof at once of the splendid endowments of the Apostle's mind, and of his familiarity with the brightest aspects of the truths which he discusses, that he cannot handle them, even for the most ordinary purposes of logical discussion, without being borne upwards on their wings to the highest regions of thought and feeling. To an ordinary man of science it would seem as if he were only muddling his subject, if, while describing the structure of a plant, he should leave the realm of prose, and talk poetically of the beauty of its flowers or the

fragrance of its fruit ; or the geologist, if, in explaining the structure of the rocks in an Alpine valley, the shadow of the picturesque should come flitting over his mind : but the genius of St. Paul could embrace in one view both the prose and the poetry of truth, and could bring the flashes of the one to brighten and intensify the demonstrations of the other.

4. A homiletical feature common to the Apostle with nearly every homiletical mind is the use of analogy and contrast. In some of the analogies which are worked out with some detail in this epistle there are obvious traces of the haste and pressure under which he wrote. The analogy in chapter v. between the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness, beautiful and instructive though it be, and giving us such a grand conception of the vast scope of saving grace, is subject to this drawback, that while all men have been plunged into ruin by the one, all men are not, in point of fact, extricated by the other. Again, the figure by which, in chapter vi., we are represented as "buried with Christ by baptism," derived from the practice of baptism by immersion, is not altogether happy, inasmuch as the momentary dip of the baptized person under the water has but a slight resemblance to the slow, deliberate process of burial. And again, the analogy in chapter vii. between the release of the widow from the law of her husband through his death, and the release of the believer from the law through his union to Christ, is neither a very direct nor a very clear illustration of the point under discussion. On the other hand, nothing can be more happy than the figure by which, in chapter xi., the Jews are compared to the natural branches of the olive, while the Gentiles are only grafted branches. Equally felicitous is the analogy denoted by the potter and the clay. In other writings he introduces other analogies, able, beautiful, and appropriate. The change which the body undergoes

at the resurrection resembles that which a grain of wheat undergoes in giving life to the new creation that springs from it. There are various kinds of flesh, as there is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars. The comparison of the human body to the tent, to be superseded by a more enduring building; of the same body to the temple of the Holy Ghost; of the Christian ministry to the workers in a field or garden where one plants and another waters, but God gives the increase; and of the retribution of the last day to a harvest-home, at which "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap"—all show what an effective handmaid to homiletic impressions analogy was in the hands of the Apostle, as indeed it has proved to every one who has sought in earnest to move the human soul.

5. So also the principle of antithesis or contrast was often called to his service. Many instances are found throughout the epistle; but the climax is reached in that noblest chapter of the whole, the eighth. "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the spirit the things of the spirit." "To be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." But the force of antithesis in vivifying and intensifying the thought is seen best in a succession of clauses, like those of 2 Corinthians iv. 8-10. "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." Such felicitous forms of expression, especially when projected with much earnestness, are usually listened to with breathless attention. We need but recall with what effect antithesis is



used by Augustine and many other of the Latin Fathers, and how efficiently it was turned to popular account by many a Puritan, like Thomas Adams or Matthew Henry.

6. Not unlike the effect of antithesis is that of accumulation. We all know that there are two ways of accumulating words. There is a careless way of heaping words of similar meaning together without any reasonable motive, which marks an uneducated speaker, and enfeebles rather than strengthens. But the effect is different when the speaker becomes excited. Accumulation then has the effect of a superlative degree, it gives momentum to the sentence, it often lends an overwhelming force. Cicero's "abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit," or Burke's "a heart dyed deep in blackness, a heart blackened to the very blackest, gangrened to the very core," are cases in point. Such too is the effect of that terrible heap of epithets under which the Apostle crushes all idea of a pagan righteousness: "Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despitesful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Not less notable is the accumulation in the eighth chapter, where the object is to hurl defiance at every enemy of Christ's people: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."



7. Of the same class is the form which links words in a chain or series. The clauses of a lengthened sentence are evolved out of each other like the drawers of a telescope. The idea which this form brings out is that of fulness, vitality, great productiveness, in some cases the clauses rising higher and higher till the climax is reached. Such is Romans v. 2-5: "We rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed: because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Again in chapter viii. 29, 30: "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified."

8. In moments of excitement, personification and apostrophe come directly to hand. Nothing could be more effective than the turn he gives to the sad sounds of nature, the groans of creation—creation becoming a living being, a mother in labour, travailing with the new heavens and the new earth. The groans are transitory, but the new life is eternal. In the depths of his depression he apostrophises himself: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" In the height of his triumph he personifies great abstractions, space and time, height and depth, things present and things to come, protesting their impotence against the children of God. In arguing for the sovereign rights of God, he turns suddenly on his opponent to demand of him, "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" Everywhere we see proofs of that wonderful vitality, that life-power which raised the Apostle so high. Nothing is dull, sleepy, heavy;

whatsoever his hand findeth to do, he does it with his might.

Before closing, let us glance at his management of the ethical application, chiefly in the memorable twelfth chapter, which in the region of ethics is as much a gem and a masterpiece as the eighth chapter is in the region of doctrine and experience.

If, disregarding the division into chapters, we read the whole epistle continuously, we shall more readily see how the preceding discussions and demonstrations have brought his readers to a point which makes ethical application comparatively easy. The temperature is much higher at the end of the eleventh chapter than it was at the beginning of the first. The feeling at the close of the eleventh is that of ecstatic wonder at the infinite grace of God. In practical Christianity there is no more powerful factor than the element of wonder, and any soul possessed by it may be worked on very powerfully by exhortations to practical godliness. A heated soul is like heated iron—the blows of the hammer are tenfold more effectual. The whole force of what has been brought out and brought home in the previous discussions is gathered up in the “therefore” of the first verse: “I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God.” First, he makes some general but very comprehensive exhortations—“Present your bodies a living sacrifice,” “Be not conformed to this world: be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds.” Next, he urges fidelity in Church duties; then returning to personal obligations, he goes into detail, drawing out from the one master-spirit, love, its various manifestations, and by a series of rapid strokes sketching a beautiful picture of Christian living. And whereas in many places he has shown himself a master of the art of expanding truth, he now shows himself master of the art of condensation. He packs into little clauses of two or three words the very

essence of Christian morality. "Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality." No better lesson could be found in the art of combining the general with the specific in practical exhortation. There are times when congregations, like individuals, are more susceptible of practical counsels than in their ordinary moods. A wise preacher takes advantage of such opportunities, strikes boldly into the practical vein, and strives to engraft new habits upon them, reaching even to very little things. It is easy to exhort men to be holy; but the earnest pastor will not be satisfied without line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little.

With such an example as St. Paul's before us, we may surely see how foolish it is to despise the homiletical features of discourse, or to speak as if style and structure were of no appreciable value. But it would be equally foolish to imagine that improvement in these respects is to be gained by a mechanical imitation of the Apostle or of any one else. The great charm of his style is its perfect naturalness. Never had writer or speaker less of self-consciousness. The gifts of genius came to him without effort, and they shaped for him methods of expression of their own. Ordinary men can have no fellowship with him there. Yet they need not deem the study of his methods utterly useless. The first step towards any attainment is consciousness of the want of it. The second is appreciation of it in those who possess it. The third, admiring study of their work. By such means, with God's blessing, preachers may learn to correct some of their faults, and to attain to more efficiency. Some may think that we belittle the noble Epistle to the Romans by dwelling on its homiletical features. We readily grant that it is not the highest aspect, but for those who are, or are to

be preachers it is an important aspect. And should it be said that to fix attention on an inferior aspect of a subject is to withdraw it from the principal, we reply that the risk of doing so is reduced to a minimum when the writing is the Epistle to the Romans, and the writer the Apostle Paul. It must be a very perverted mind that, in the midst of such a study, can forget the great and solemn ends to which the epistle is directed. It must be a pitiable soul that amid all the tokens of spiritual power that made his words so effectual, can deem matters of form and style and structure as anything more than the outward frame of the living organism. But form and style and structure have surely a definite place among the objects to which the preacher of the gospel is bound to direct his thoughts. And if we make the example of St. Paul in these, as in higher matters, the subject of appreciative and admiring study, we may gradually acquire for ourselves more of his methods, and by God's blessing more of his power.

W. G. BLAIKIE.

---

*THE THANKS OF AN APOSTLE.*

*THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.*

In the Epistle to Philemon, we saw the way in which an Apostle asks a favour; in the Epistle to the Philippians, we see how the same Apostle returns thanks. We know that St. Paul refused to take any payment from the Churches which he founded, and over which he watched. It was not that he did not feel he had any right to this mark of gratitude, but he abstained from using this right from personal reasons which he explains in 1 Corinthians ix. Not having entered freely, like the Twelve, into the apostolic ministry, but having been, as it were, forced into it by Divine

constraint, he was specially anxious to show that he freely fulfilled the mission thus laid upon him, so to speak, against his will. The idea of performing his apostolic functions like one sentenced to forced labour was insupportable to him; he had rather die than so preach. He felt that in the service of the gospel he must breathe the pure air of liberty and love, and this he could only do by preaching it without charge. This disinterested conduct brought honour to the gospel among those to whom he carried it, and distinguished the messenger of Christ from the mercenary rhetors who itinerated among the cities of Greece. It was thus the practice of the Apostle to support himself entirely with the work of his hands. He even provided in the same way for the maintenance and travelling expenses of his fellow-workers. He himself reminds the elders of the Church of Ephesus of this, when taking leave of them with the pathetic words, "Ye yourselves know how these hands have ministered to my necessities, and to them that were with me" (Acts xx. 34).

There was one Church however with regard to which he made an exception, and from which he consented to accept, from time to time, help in his missionary work. This was the Church at Philippi, the first Church founded by him in Europe. He had found there, from the very first, such warm and devoted hearts, that he felt free to accept gifts from them without fear of compromising the dignity of his ministry or the honour of the gospel. In the Epistle we are about to study he says: "Ye yourselves also know, ye Philippians, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no Church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving, but ye only; for even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my need" (Phil. iv. 15-17).

This relation, so honourable to the Church at Philippi, was kept up through the whole course of his ministry, so



that he wrote many years later to the Church at Corinth : "I robbed other Churches, taking wages of them that I might minister unto you ; and when I was present with you, and was in want, I was not a burden on any man ; for the brethren, when they came from Macedonia, supplied the measure of my want " (2 Cor. xi. 8, 9).

It seems however, that in the course of time the zeal of the Philippian Church for its Apostle had somewhat abated, and that it had neglected to testify its affection for him, at any rate in this form. We gather this from Philippians iv. 10, where Paul says : "I rejoice in the Lord greatly, that now at length ye have revived your thought for me ; wherein ye did indeed take thought, but ye lacked opportunity."

Paul's captivity in Rome seems however to have revived their affectionate solicitude, and by one of themselves, Epaphroditus, they had again sent help to the Apostle ; and it is to acknowledge this kindness that he writes the Epistle now before us. This is properly therefore a letter of thanks, but the thanks are those of an Apostle. Just as the father of a family, absent for a time from home and children, on receiving from them some token of affection, does not simply write to thank them, but goes on to give them tidings of himself, of the state of his affairs, and his hope of coming back, and adds such instructions and warnings as he thinks needful for their good : so the Apostle, in writing to his spiritual children at Philippi, blends admonitions with tidings of himself, and closes with words of gratitude for the benefit received from them. Such is the simple outline of the Epistle to the Philippians.

We may notice first one or two points of interest in the opening verses. Paul associates Timothy with himself as the sender of this letter. He writes it indeed with his own hand, and speaks of Timothy in the third person ; but he desires to give his young fellow-worker this place



of honour, for he does not forget that Timothy worked with him in founding the Church at Philippi (Acts xvi.). In the same way, in writing the two letters to the Thessalonian Church, he associates with himself Silas and Timothy, who had assisted him in founding it, and who were with him at Corinth at the time when he wrote. The bearing of the Apostle towards his fellow labourers in the gospel is always marked by this gentle and courteous consideration. We have another proof of this in the opening verses. He does not describe himself by the name Apostle, in which Timothy could not have shared, but by the more general and humble title, "servant of Jesus Christ," in which they were both one.

Those to whom the Epistle is addressed are called "saints in Christ Jesus," which means those who are consecrated to God by the faith which joins them to Christ. The name of Christ is the bond which unites in one body the writers and those to whom they are writing. It is in the holy atmosphere of communion with Christ that this letter was written and is to be read.

Lastly, he adds a more special feature. In contemplating the Church he is addressing, the Apostle's thought rests on two classes of persons in it who bear a special seal of their office. These are the bishops and deacons;<sup>1</sup> the former entrusted with the administration of the Church and its direction, temporal and spiritual; the latter set apart to minister to the wants of the poor of the Church, the widows and orphans, the sick, Christian travellers passing through the city, etc. This is the first time that these two sets of officers are mentioned in the Apostle's addresses to the Churches; and we note with interest this reference to these simple and indispensable elements of ecclesiastical organisa-

<sup>1</sup> We shall discuss, when we come to the pastoral Epistles, the question of the relation between the bishops and the elders or presbyters in the New Testament.

tion, the foundations of the historical development of the Church in all ages. We may well suppose that the Church of Philippi was thus thoroughly equipped for service, because as the oldest of the Churches in Europe, it had had more time to develop its institutions.

In St. Paul's Epistles, the opening words are generally followed by thanksgiving rendered to God for the work of salvation wrought by Him among the believers to whom the letter is addressed. The Epistle to the Philippians is not likely to be an exception in this respect. And as in the other thanksgivings, special and characteristic points are brought out, so it is here. In *vv.* 3-11 the Apostle dwells with peculiar gladness on the interest which the Philippians have taken from the very first in the preaching of the gospel,<sup>1</sup> being confident that the good work thus begun in them will be perfected until the day of Jesus Christ. This assurance has been strengthened by the love they have shown him during the severe imprisonment which he is enduring at the time for the gospel's sake. Thus his love prompts him to pray for them that their "love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all discernment, that they may approve things that are excellent, and be sincere and void of offence unto the day of Christ."

With *v.* 12 the letter properly begins. It may be divided into four parts—two of tidings, two of exhortations. And, first, he brings before them the state of things in Rome, that they may see what progress the gospel has made since his coming to that city (*chap.* i. 12-26). His captivity, so far from having been a hindrance, has in many ways helped forward the work of evangelisation in the capital. In the

<sup>1</sup> It seems to me that the expression used by Paul in *v.* 5 implies something more than their own fellowship in the gospel. The term *εὐαγγέλιον* is used by St. Paul sometimes for the gospel objectively, but more usually for the act of preaching the gospel. See especially 1 Thess. i. 5.

first place, the knowledge of Christ has spread throughout the whole prætorian guard, those vast barracks of the emperor's bodyguard. It was carried there no doubt by means of the soldiers who took it in turns to be the Apostle's keepers, and through the visitors who came to him in prison. Thus the very presence of the Apostle in Rome stimulated the missionary zeal of the Christians themselves. There were no doubt many who became propagandists from unworthy motives, and out of a spirit of hostility to Paul. These were the Judaisers, the fanatical adherents of the law, who preached Jesus rather in the interests of Judaism than of the gospel. But, as St. Paul nobly says, "What then? in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" (*vv.* 12-18).

It has been objected that these words are opposed to the anathema which the Apostle pronounces (*Gal. i. 6 et seq.*) against Judaising preachers. But the two positions are altogether different. The Judaisers in Galatia came on purpose to overthrow Churches which had been founded by Paul and were doing well: the Judaisers in Rome preached Jesus among the heathen of the capital; and this preaching might have good results, in spite of the admixture of error.

From this point the Apostle passes on to more directly personal matters. He has a full assurance that all the events to which he has thus referred will turn to his salvation,—whether by death, if the Lord is pleased to call him to the honour of martyrdom, or by life, if He permits him still to labour on a little longer for the good of the Church on earth. He himself is perfectly content with either alternative. But he has a conviction that he shall live, and that it will yet be given him to stand once again in the midst of the Philippian Church, for their furtherance and joy of faith (*vv.* 19-22).

Such is the first section of the Epistle, by means of which

the reader can easily realise the whole position of things in Rome. And now Paul transports himself in thought into the midst of the Church at Philippi, and addresses to it some exhortations which, from the report brought by Epaphroditus, he judges to be needful. This second section is comprised in chaps. i. 27–ii. 18.

He first charges them to be united in the defence of the faith and in resistance to their adversaries. If in this warfare they are called to suffer, let them look at these sufferings endured for Christ's sake, as a privilege bringing them into yet more complete oneness with Him. He charges them by the love they bear him to fill him with joy by laying aside all the selfish and vainglorious considerations which so easily disturb the mind, and to be of the same mind which was in Christ Jesus, who, dwelling in the eternal glory before He stooped to earth, might have come to reign, to rule, to judge, to be worshipped in His Godhead, but chose rather to empty Himself, and to lay aside His glorious prerogative. Instead of claiming, as He might justly have done, to be equal with God, He despoiled Himself of His Divine attributes, and took the form of a servant, and was found in fashion as a man. And even as a man, He humbled Himself yet more, becoming obedient to the laws of God and man, and laying down of Himself that human life for which He had exchanged the Divine. And how has God testified His satisfaction in love like this? "He hath highly exalted Him, and given Him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (chap. ii. 5–11). How could the Apostle have said more eloquently to the Philippians, "Fear not to humble and to empty yourselves: it is the way to fill up that which is behind of the sufferings of Christ" (chap. ii. 11)?

To this exhortation to unity through humility, which bears on their common Church life, the Apostle adds another, which naturally follows, but has a more personal reference. He charges them to work out with diligence, nay, even with fear and trembling, their own salvation; by which he means their sanctification. Let them bear in mind that, separated from God, they have no power either to do or even to will that which is good, and that a very little thing suffices to break the union between the soul and God; murmurings, disputings, self-will, any or all of these alienate from the life of God. Hence even the most advanced have still ground for fear and trembling (*vv.* 12, 13). The Philippians have moreover duties towards the world, in the midst of which they are to shine like torches; and to this end they must be blameless and harmless, sons of God without rebuke among a crooked and perverse generation (*vv.* 14-16). And if, as they walk along this way which St. Paul has marked out for them, they find that he himself has been offered upon the sacrifice and service of their faith, they must not give themselves up to bitter lamentations. Let them rather rejoice with him that such an honour has been put upon him (*chap.* ii. 17-28).

This is the second section of the Epistle, containing a series of exhortations relative to the duties of the Philippians to one another, to themselves, to the world in which they live, and to the Apostle himself. They all arise very naturally out of the position of the Church and his relation to it.

In the third section (*chap.* ii. 19-30) Paul proceeds to give the Philippians tidings of two brethren in whom they have a special interest. One of these is Timothy, who, with Silas, had helped Paul to found the Church at Philippi, and whom the Apostle is preparing to send shortly to them, that he may bring him back tidings of their welfare after a sojourn among them. He is worthy to be received by them



with all respect, for while others are absorbed in their own affairs (perhaps Paul is thinking of Demas, Col. iv. 14 and 2 Tim. iv. 10), Timothy seeks the things that are Christ Jesus's. The Apostle adds in passing that he himself hopes soon to follow Timothy to Philippi.

But before sending to them his young fellow-worker, he deems it needful at once to send back Epaphroditus, one of themselves, their messenger, who had brought to him their bounty, and had fallen sick after his arrival. He had even been nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him, and on the Apostle also, that he might not have sorrow upon sorrow. Paul commends him to their most loving care, since it was "for the work of Christ he had come nigh unto death, not regarding his life to supply that which was lacking in their service. From the expression in *v.* 28, "I have sent him," we gather that Epaphroditus was already returned at the time when the Philippian Church was gathered to read Paul's letter, and consequently that he himself had been the bearer of it.

It has sometimes been thought that the Apostle intended to end his letter here, but felt himself suddenly pressed to add the hortatory passage which follows. It would have been impossible however that he should close his letter without expressing the thanks which were its special object. Hence it cannot have been his intention to lay down his pen at this point.

The fourth section, which is again one of exhortation, and which includes chaps. iii. 1-iv. 1, forms a complete and beautiful whole. It is an exhortation to Christian joy. The exhortation itself is contained in the first two verses of chap. iii. The joy to which Paul bids them is joy in the Lord. He has already charged them to be joyful (chap. ii. 18), and he comes back to the same point now to put them on their guard against anything that might rob them of their rejoicing and to encourage them by his own



example. The adversaries against whom they are to guard this treasure are the same of whom he has so often warned them, whom he calls "dogs" because of their daring, "evil workers" because of their cupidity, the "circumcision" (mutilation) because of their zeal for circumcision. They are Jews and Judaisers. The Philippians must not forget that those are the true circumcision in the sight of God whom the Spirit of God has consecrated and who serve Him in spirit and in truth.

Here Paul sets before them as an encouragement his own example. He, who possessed in a higher and fuller degree than any of these Judaisers the righteousness of the law, had not feared to cast away this self-righteousness as so much dung, that he might win Christ, in whom is the righteousness of God by faith (*vv.* 4-9). And now possessing this righteousness before God, he is striving after holiness, and to this end he needs no other means but Christ Himself, the power of whose resurrection-life he seeks to know, and by the fellowship of His sufferings to become conformed unto His death. He has ever before him this great end—that he may attain to the resurrection of the faithful at the coming of Christ. But in order to attain this end, it is needful to act like the athlete in the arena; he never stops to look back and to regret the things he has left behind, but gazes steadily before him, his soul bent on laying hold of that crown for which Christ has laid hold of him (*vv.* 10-14).

Paul next teaches the Philippians that those who are perfect will show it by striving, as he is striving, after perfection. It is evident that by the perfect, Paul does not mean perfect saints. Those who are perfect are contrasted with those who are babes in Christ (1 Cor. xiv. 20). He thus designates men who have arrived at Christian maturity, the state of constant communion with the Lord. Such a state does not exclude the necessity of progress,

as Paul himself proves. If they are as yet divided by some differences of view, let them seek the Divine illumination in which all such differences will vanish. But on this one point at least, let them be agreed—that they are all striving after perfection, as imitators together of Paul and of those who with him are their ensample (vv. 15-17).

By this steadfast course they will break loose from those merely nominal Christians, against whom the Apostle has so often warned them, and of whom he cannot now speak without tears—men who dishonour the cross of Christ, who make a god of their belly, who mind earthly things, and whose end will be perdition (vv. 18, 19).

But, on the other hand, those who are steadfast and immovable have their pattern in the heavenlies, from whence they look for Him who shall glorify, by changing into His own likeness, the very body of their humiliation. In Him therefore let these Christians stand fast, who are now the joy of the Apostle and soon will be his crown.

This fourth section may be summed up in two words: joy in Christ arising out of the righteousness of faith; and a constant striving after perfection in Him.

We have already observed, that after the treatment of the subject there is generally a concluding passage in Paul's letters, containing personal communications, commissions, and greetings. It is so in this Epistle, only this concluding portion is longer than in the other letters, because the Apostle has to speak of two subjects in considerable detail.

The first is a rivalry between two women of influence in the Church, which was hindering its welfare. The Apostle invites his faithful colleague, probably the head of the episcopal college, to help these women in the struggle with themselves, for they had been valuable fellow labourers with him in his work at Philippi, no less than Clement and the other brethren. As the names of these two women are *Euodias*, which means *the good way*, and *Syntyche*, *happy*

*meeting*, some critics, whose one idea it is to discover everywhere traces of antagonism between the Pauline and Judæo-Christian party, have fancied that in the names of these two women there was the symbolic designation of the two parties. The one called *the good way* designates the Pauline party, which had always adhered to the good way; the other, *happy meeting*, represents the Judæo-Christian party, which is ultimately to fall in with the other and pursue the same track. Such are the ingenious vagaries sometimes resorted to by a school which boasts its critical acumen. "Greatly astonished," says Reuss, "would these good deaconesses be, if they came back to life and found themselves thus transformed into theological puppets!"

At this point the Apostle returns to the hortatory tone, and again briefly charges the Church to delight itself in whatsoever things are true, honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report (*vv.* 4-9).

Then he passes to the second matter of a personal nature on which he wishes to speak. He had already twice alluded to the help in money which the Philippians had sent him (*chaps.* i. 5, 7; ii. 25, 30). But he had not yet distinctly thanked them. This grateful task he had reserved to the close of his letter. He performs it in the most graceful and noble manner. He gives the Philippians to understand that if this act on their part has given him lively joy, it is even more on their account than his own. He has indeed long learned, in whatsoever state he is, even in abject poverty, therewith to be content. But none the less he has received with true gladness of heart the generous ministry of the Philippians to his needs, for he knows, not only how to be in want, but how to abound. Strange that the same critic to whom we just now referred should call this a "thankless thanksgiving," so construing it in order to support his own view that the Epistle is not genuine! In conclusion, the Apostle declares that *his* God, to whom the Philippians

have ministered in the person of His servant, will repay all his indebtedness, and will fulfil every need of theirs according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus (iv. 10-20).

The Epistle closes with some greetings. Paul salutes every saint in Christ Jesus, in his own name and that of the brethren with him, without naming any of them; which is an argument that Luke, who was so well known to the Philippians, was not now with him. He sends a salutation from the saints in Rome, specially mentioning those of Cæsar's household. This has been interpreted as betraying some vanity on Paul's part, as if his whole life was not sufficient disproof of any such unworthy feeling. Let us rather say that in these first converts in the imperial palace he saw the earnest of the future conversion of the Roman world, and of the emperor himself, to the gospel of Christ, now kept in bonds in Rome in his person.

The mention of the household of Cæsar, as well as of the prætorian guard (chap. i. 13), leaves no room to doubt that this letter was written from Rome; and the detailed description (chap. i.) of the influence of Paul's presence in the capital proves that it was written after the Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians, consequently towards the close of the year 63 or early in 64. Those who hold that it was written at Cæsarea are compelled to have recourse to very forced explanations of the expression, "Cæsar's household."

This has been called the most epistolary of all the Pauline epistles. It was not indeed intended to treat didactically any aspect of Scripture truth. The only doctrinal passage which it contains at all is that relating to the person of Christ (chap. ii. 5-11); and this is introduced for a directly practical purpose, namely, to show the Philippians, by this supreme example of self-abnegation, the sacrifices which they ought to be willing to make for one another's sake. His aim is to incite them to the practice

of a Christ-like humility, not to teach them anything new in the way of abstract doctrine.

We are therefore at a loss to understand what motive could have induced any one to forge such a letter, which contains scarcely anything but practical exhortations and messages. Baur was the first who had the courage to cast doubt upon its authenticity; but he found many who differed from him even in his own school, particularly Hilgenfeld, who calls this epistle "the swan-song of St. Paul." Holsten adopts, but on different grounds, the same theory as Baur. He regards this Epistle as the oldest canonical record of the attempt to reconcile the Judaisers and the Paulites. It is certainly a curious way of attempting to conciliate the two parties, to speak in such terms as Paul uses at the beginning of chap. iii. in reference to the Judaisers. The same critic says again: "Paul would never have represented the Christian doctrine of justification as it is put in chap. iii. 2-14, where it is made to consist in the progress of the knowledge of Christ in the heart of the believer. The justification taught by Paul is based upon the objective righteousness of Christ Himself." But is not this precisely what St. Paul says in this passage, where he contrasts the righteousness acquired by works, which he counts but dung, with "that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (iii. 9.) And if he goes on to say in v. 10, "that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed to His death," this inward knowledge of Christ is not represented as the basis of justification, but, on the contrary, as its end ("that I may know Him"). These two verses 9, 10, give us, in fact, an epitome respectively of Romans i.-iv. and Romans vi.-viii. 1.

Holsten thinks that he discovers a contradiction between Paul's conception of the person of Christ and that of the



writer of the Epistle to the Philippians. Both hold the pre-existence of the Lord: but, according to 1 Corinthians xv. 45, Paul seems to regard the pre-existent Christ only as a man endowed with a spiritual body, and serving as a type of the natural man; while in the Epistle to the Philippians, the expression, "being in the form of God" (chap. ii. 6) implies the divinity of the pre-existing Christ. That Paul believed in the divinity of the pre-existent Christ is an unquestionable fact, though Holzmann has quite recently attempted to deny it; but that he believed in the humanity of the pre-existent Christ is false, and derives no support from the passage quoted (1 Cor. xv.), for the simple reason that that Scripture is referring not to the pre-existent Christ at all, but to the Christ glorified in His spiritual body, the life of our glorified resurrection bodies.

Schürer, who shows a singular independence in his criticism, says: "It is generally recognised in our day that the rejection by Baur of the Epistle to the Philippians was a great mistake. He has had but few followers on this point; among them is Holsten, who has devoted much labour to the subject. But his arguments are so foolish that one is sometimes tempted to put them down as slips of the pen."<sup>1</sup> In an earlier article Schürer had said: "The researches of Holsten are full of sagacity; but the reasons alleged by him for denying the genuineness of the Epistle to the Philippians can have no weight, unless we take the Apostle Paul (the most living and versatile character the world has ever seen) to be such a slave of rigid routine that he cannot write one epistle that shall not be exactly like all the others, that he can only repeat in each what he has said in the preceding, and in the very same words. If we are not prepared to admit this, all the objections raised against the authenticity of the Epistle to the Philippians fall to the ground."

<sup>1</sup> *Literaturzeitung*, Nov. 5th, 1880.



Let us only think for a moment of the passage in this Epistle relating to Epaphroditus (chap. ii.). This messenger of the Philippian Church had been ill, very ill; but, says Paul, "God had mercy on him, and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow." What writer of the second century would have put such words as these into the mouth of Paul? Here is nothing extraordinary, nothing distinctively apostolic, one may be tempted to say. Here is no miracle; everything is simply natural and human. Paul is in sorrow, like any one of us; he prays, as we might pray; he is heard. There is nothing here characteristic of the time when the glorification of the Apostles had already begun. What would have been the object of inventing such details, which are of no value except as marking the relation between Paul and his readers? In the absence of any reasonable object to be answered by such a deception, Reuss is surely right in saying "that the apocryphal author could not have had any other aim but to prove, by a composition in Pauline style, that it was possible in the second century to write just as Paul wrote in the first."

The Epistle to the Philippians is a familiar letter, but it bears none the less the impress of an Apostle; and though shorter and more colloquial than the rest, it has its own place, and that an important one, in the sacred canon. It serves as a commentary on the last two verses of the book of the Acts, which contain but a very cursory allusion to St. Paul's captivity in Rome. It is only by the help of this Epistle that we can form an exact idea of the religious movement in the capital, which followed on the arrival of the Apostle. As we read these lines we understand how exultant his soul became, as he witnessed the irresistible power of the Gospel in the midst of the heathen world.

This Epistle brings home to us the cheering conviction that among the Churches founded by the Apostle there was

at least one which fitly responded to his care, and realised that which he fondly desired to see in all. Among the several letters to the Churches which have come down to us as written by Paul, this letter to the Church at Philippi occupies the same place as the letter to the Church at Philadelphia among the seven in the Revelation. There were some little rivalries in the Church, and a certain spirit of self-complacency, which hindered progress in sanctification and, as a consequence, spiritual joy; but this was all the fault Paul had to find with a Church which he lovingly describes as his "joy and crown." At the same time he rejoices to see in it the first carrying out of the complete organisation which he desires for all the Churches. The Epistle to the Philippians thus becomes, as it were, the natural stepping-stone to the pastoral epistles, in which Paul institutes distinctly and for all time, the two orders of ministry here mentioned—the bishops and deacons.

Lastly, the great Christological passage in chapter ii., written with a definite practical purpose, acquires a double value from this very circumstance, that it alludes, as an accepted and recognised fact in the Philippian Church, to a view of the person of Christ, entirely in harmony with the teaching of the fourth Gospel. That fundamental saying of St. John, "*The Word was made flesh,*" has nowhere so striking a parallel or, so to speak, so exact a commentary, as in these words of St. Paul: "Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant." If the Epistle to the Philippians is really genuine, as we can see no room to doubt, there can be no ground for relegating to the second century the origin of the formula of St. John. We have but to seek its roots in the teaching and therefore in the consciousness of Him who was the Master at once of Paul and of John.

F. GODET.

*THE ROYAL COURT OF ADIABENE.*

AT two points the Indian Ocean, called by the ancients (we know not why) the Erythræan Sea, has through narrow gates forced for itself an opening into the southern continent of Asia. Arabia has thereby become a peninsula, girded on the east by the Persian Gulf, and on the west by the Arabian Gulf. If we sail up the Persian Gulf, between the Arabian and the Persian coasts, and journey by land farther northward to the Schatt-el-Arab, the combined Euphrates and Tigris, before we reach Basra, famous in the stories of the "Thousand and One Nights," we come upon a locality known as Moammerah. It lies just at the point where the Karûn (Eulæus of the ancients) empties itself into the Schatt. This locality was called in the first half of the first Christian century, to which we transport ourselves back, Charax, more exactly Charax of Spasinos (Pasinus).<sup>1</sup> It was the capital of a small kingdom.

We are here in Southern Babylonia, in the Sumêr or Shinar, the former domain of that Merodach-baladan who sought to gain an ally in the person of Hezekiah, king of Judah. If we were from this point to trace the course of the Euphrates farther northward, we should pass by Ur, the birthplace of Abraham, and the ancient necropolis Warka, and reach Hilla, situated upon the ruins of the ancient Babylon; but we strike to the east, pass upon the banks of the Tigris the old caliphs' residence, Bagdad, and farther on quit the North Babylonian for Assyrian soil. There, in the mid course of the Tigris, once lay Assur, the earliest capital of the Assyrian Empire,<sup>2</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> De Goeje identified with this Charax the Omayyadic coining place, es-Sâmiye, in the district of Wasit, in Irâk, but wrongly, after the judgment of Noeldeke, Blau, and Stickel.

<sup>2</sup> The Vâwût i. 119, 16 ss., says: "In the neighbourhood of es-Selâmiye (a small place eastward of Mosul; there is between both about one farsang) is an

Kelach and Nineveh, from the time of Asurnasirpalus the alternating seats of the Assyrian princes. Below Kelach the great Zab here joins the Tigris, and below Assur the little Zab (lat.  $35^{\circ} 15'$ ), both coming from the east, from the Zagros range which separates Assyria and Media, Irâk and Êran. Here in the vicinity of Mosul, on the left bank of the Tigris, below the network of the rivers entering the Tigris from the east, was the maternal soil of the Assyrian kingdom. Here shone resplendent the colossal palatial and temple edifices of the Assyrian kings; hither the Asiatic princes crowded from far and near, among these at one time Ahaz of Judah, in order to cast themselves at the feet of the king of kings (*šar šarrâni*). But at the time of the first Christian century, to which we transport ourselves back, this ancient Assyrian glory had long sunk down into that earth from which its remains are being disinterred only in the present day. "Thou turnest mortals to dust," says Ps. xc., the Moses-psalm, of God, "and sayest, 'Return, ye children of men.'" The new generation of that day had hardly so much as a suspicion that the soil under their feet concealed the ruins of a mighty empire, of the greatest significance in the history of the world and of civilization. The land was still indeed sometimes called Assyria, or with the Aramaic change of *sh* into *t*, Atyria (Aturia); but from the time of the Diadochoi, of whom Seleucus Nicator had made Babylon and the surrounding lands tributary to himself, it was called Adiabene. The name is geographically as significant as Mesopotamia; for as Mesopotamia denotes the land between the Tigris and the Euphrates, so also Adiabene, originally Diaban or Dibân, signifies the land

entirely waste town, named **أقور** (Akûr); it seems as if the whole land had got its name from this town—God knows it." Elsewhere (iii. 113, 22) he names that ruinous town **أثور**, not **اقور**; but these two forms have really existed.

of the two Zab, because they combined Zab or Dab with the Semitic name for the wolf (ذَيْب), according to which the great Zab was called in Greek Lykos (the Wolf), and the little Zab Kapros (the Boar).<sup>1</sup>

At the time to which we carry ourselves back, the dominion of the Greeks had long been succeeded by the dominion of the Parthians (about B.C. 250), that kingdom of the Arsacidæ which maintained itself, in endless conflicts with the Romans, during almost five centuries. Adiabene, leaning upon the great Parthian kingdom, formed a small kingdom of its own. The position was a difficult one; but its rulers were enabled by prudence and vigour to surmount the danger of being absorbed by the Parthians or abolished by the Romans. The religion there prevailing was at any rate the Eranian; the centre of this cultus was the adoration of fire, which was looked upon as a heavenly being, sent down by Ahuramazda into the world of earth; the twenty-five men whom Ezekiel (chap. viii. 16 *seq.*) is led to see in the Temple at Jerusalem, praying to the sun and holding in their hands the sacred branch, the Bareçman or Barsom (in Hebrew הַזִּמְרָה),<sup>2</sup> are apostate Jews who have addicted themselves to this Eranian fire-worship. But Buddhism likewise had penetrated as far as Eran in the time of the Seleucidæ, which is evident from the fact that Antiochos Theos gave permission, about the year B.C. 260, to the Indian king Açoka to erect veterinary hospitals throughout these western provinces.<sup>3</sup> Nor were Jews wanting here either. The exiles of the kingdom of Israel must, it is true, be left out of consideration; the captivity has buried them without leaving a trace behind. But the exiles of Judah, who kept their

<sup>1</sup> See Mordtmann in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, vol. xxxiii., p. 123.

<sup>2</sup> See Spiegel's *Eranische Alterthumskunde*, vol. iii. (1878), p. 571.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 717.



nationality in virtue of their religion, had returned but in small part to their fatherland, and a lively intercourse was maintained between the Jews of Palestine and their countrymen in Babylonia, in Mesène (מישן), with its capital Apamea, and likewise in Hadjab (הדיב), *i.e.* Adiabene.<sup>1</sup>

At the time of the emperor Caligula, a king named Monobaz reigned over Adiabene.<sup>2</sup> He had as his consort his sister Helena; marriages between brothers and sisters were not incestuous according to the view of the Eranians; they were even a favourite form of marriage in the royal family of the Achæmenidæ, since the relation of brother and sister was regarded as indicating the highest possible degree of equality of birth. Helena had already borne to her consort a son, Monobaz, and he had sons also of other women, and Helena was once more near her delivery, when King Monobaz thought he heard a voice in sleep which pointed to the son whom Helena should bear as destined for high things. In reality she brought forth a son; the king called him Izates, and lavished upon him as much love as though he had had only him, and no sons besides. Here however it is already seen that in this royal house of Adiabene there prevailed a delicate and generous mode of thought and action, such as was unexampled elsewhere in Oriental courts. Monobaz was not blind to the fact that the other sons rightly felt themselves

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Graetz, *Mesene und seine jüdische Bevölkerung*, 1879.

<sup>2</sup> Nowhere is the name of the capital of Adiabene expressly mentioned. From *Moses Chorenensis*, ii. 35, it seems to have been Edessa. The kings of Adiabene however did not reside in Edessa, but only a collateral line, which entered with the dynasty of the Abgars, the sovereigns of Osroëne (see Alfred v. Gutschmid, in *Rheinisches Museum*, 1864, page 171 *seq.*). Professor Nöldeke writes me as follows: "There is nothing handed down by tradition about the residence of the kings of Adiabene; but in all likelihood they resided at Arbela, the only renowned city, not only in *Hadyab* itself, the land between the two Zab, but in Assyria generally, that is, the whole empire of those kings who named themselves 'of Adiabene,' because Adiabene was their original domain."



aggrieved by this his preference for Izates, and that the envy and hatred which this favour called forth proceeded from the laudable desire of being loved in equal measure by their father. He sent away Izates therefore to Charax Spasinu, and commended him there to the protection of King Abennerigos (*Ἀβεννήριγος*). The latter proved quite worthy of the confidence of his friend, received the young man affectionately, and gave him his daughter Symacho (*Συμαχώ*) in marriage. Now, when Monobaz felt that he had not much longer to live, he caused his darling to come to him, yet did not long retain him at the court. He bestowed upon him Carrhæ, that Harrân (*Ἥρραν*) whence Abraham entered upon his journey to Canaan, and among whose most valuable products is numbered that *amomum* (*ἄμωμον*) widely prized and especially a favourite at Rome. Here in Carrhæ Izates remained until the death of his father.

Upon the demise of the father, it was again shown that in this royal house another spirit prevailed than was found elsewhere in the East, where the heir apparent was wont to secure the throne to himself by the slaughter of the other hereditary princes. The nobles of the kingdom declared themselves ready to accomplish this massacre in the interest of Izates; but Helena refused her consent, and only made the concession that the brothers should be kept in ward till Izates came. So great confidence, however, had she in her elder son, Monobaz, that she named him vicar-regent of the kingdom, and committed to him the royal insignia. And when Izates came, Monobaz surrendered to his brother diadem and signet-ring and sampsêra (*σαμψηρά*), *i.e.* the sceptre with the sun-emblem, and retired into private life.

And this Izates had meanwhile become a proselyte to Judaism. A Jewish merchant, Ananias, had found opportunity in Charax of entering into religious conversation with

the ladies at the court, and he had succeeded in winning over Izates also to belief in the One God and in His revealed law; and at the same time he gained the affection of Izates to so great an extent that the latter, when he returned from Charax to Adiabene, could not bring himself to part with him, but took him with him. And what a receptive soil the religion of revelation found in this royal court is evident from the fact that, when Izates was hastening thither from Carrhæ to become his father's successor, Helena had in the interval become a proselyte of Judaism. The conduct of these two was henceforth regulated not only by their conscience but also by the word of God in Law and Prophets. Brothers and kinsmen were released from the prison, and sent, some to Rome, where from the year 41 the emperor Claudius was reigning, and some to the Parthian king Artabanus. His brother Monobaz, however, Izates retained beside him.

It was now only a question with Izates whether he should submit to circumcision or not. Helena was opposed to it, because it would awaken the ill-will of his subjects. Ananias too, who shared the concern of the queen-mother, dissuaded him therefrom, saying that even without circumcision he could be a sincere worshipper of the true God. But a Jew Eleazar, who had come from Galilee, so successfully urged circumcision upon the young king as a matter of conscience, that he underwent it. And in the sequel it was found that he had not thereby alienated the hearts of his people from himself. He continued to be esteemed and beloved; for he was by his piety, the purity of his morals, his magnanimity, and the firmness of his character, a bright example, whose light was seen from afar. Nor could Monobaz, his brother, withstand the contagious influence of this example. He too embraced the Jewish religion; and the whole court of Adiabene renounced heathenism and professed their faith in the God of Israel.

The magnates were highly incensed. They stirred up the Arabian prince Abia (*Ἀβίας*) to war against Izates; but the plan miscarried. Abia was beaten, and took his own life to escape being made the prisoner of Izates. They now made the same attempt with the king of the Parthians, Vologeses I. Izates had formerly assisted the father of this Vologeses, Artabanus III., to recover his throne; Artabanus had in gratitude bestowed upon him Nisibis and the surrounding district, and conferred upon him the prerogative, in other cases peculiar to the kings of Parthia, of wearing an upright tiara and sleeping in a golden bed. Vologeses demanded of Izates that he should renounce this distinction. He could not however comply with such a disgraceful request, but took up arms; yet it did not come to a battle, for Vologeses was compelled to withdraw the army he had led against Izates, in order to resist an invasion of the Scythians into Parthia. This happened in the year 58 of the Christian era, thus in the time of the emperor Nero. Izates died shortly afterwards, though not until he had appointed as his successor his brother Monobaz, the faithful guardian of his throne.

In the year 44 Izates had granted to his mother her request to be permitted to travel to Jerusalem. At the time of her coming thither there was prevailing in Palestine that famine under the emperor Claudius which, as we learn from Acts xi. 28, was predicted by the prophet Agabus, and for the assuaging of which Paul and Barnabas brought the collection of the Christians of Antioch to the brethren in Judæa. Is it possible that Helena heard anything there in Jerusalem of Jesus the crucified, and the Church of those who believed in Him as the Messiah? We may well doubt it, for the august lady was so closely encircled by the notabilities of the priesthood, of the sanhedrin, and of the academies, that no intelligence, or at least no authentic intelligence, concerning Christ and Christianity could find access to her. But she too did her part to relieve the dis-

tress. She despatched some of her train to Alexandria, there to buy up great quantities of corn, and some to Cyprus, thence to obtain ample stores of dried figs. And when her son Izates heard of the famine, he too sent large sums to the representatives of Jerusalem for distribution among those in want.

As for other Asiatic princes Rome, the mistress of the world, exerted the strongest power of attraction, so for the royal family of Adiabene Jerusalem, as the city of the earth under the special favour of the One true God, exerted a like power of attraction. Helena possessed there her own palace in the midst of the Acra, as the northern part of the lower terrace of the Upper City, lying to the west of Zion, was then called. Here she received the sad news of the death of her son. She hastened back to Adiabene, but did not long survive him. Monobaz assuredly fulfilled a last wish of the two departed ones, in bringing their bones to Jerusalem, and there, so Josephus says, depositing them in the pyramids (*ἐν ταῖς πυραμίσιν*) which his mother had erected, three in number, at a distance of three stadia from the city. Probably this is the spacious sepulchre in the rock, now in ruins, but still bearing traces of its original splendour, which lies outside of the Damascus Gate, on the road to Nablús. It is now a French private possession. In one of the chambers, which De Sauley opened in 1863, was found a sarcophagus in a complete state of preservation, containing a female skeleton. Upon the lid it bore an inscription in Aramaic and one in Hebrew, both consisting of eight letters. It has been placed in the Louvre at Paris, where it is now to be found. The entrance to the sepulchral cave was originally adorned with three pyramids, which Jerome saw yet standing in his day.<sup>1</sup>

My authority hitherto has been Josephus, in the twentieth

<sup>1</sup> See Luncz' *Annual (Jahrbuch)*, art. "Jerusalem," vol. i., p. 93. Vienna, 1872.

book of his *Antiquities*. In his work on the Jewish War mention is frequently made of the Monument of Helena, her palace within the Aera, and the court (*αὐλή*) of Monobaz, as topographical points of direction; and we are told in the same work<sup>1</sup> that sons, brothers, and kinsmen of king Izates fought in the ranks of the defenders of Jerusalem against the Romans, and were by Cæsar led away in bonds to Rome as hostages. In the Talmud and Midrash, Helena and her children have already become an object of legend, and much is related concerning the painful scrupulosity of herself and her family; *e.g.* that she kept the vow of a Nazarite seven years in her own land, and then, after she had come into the Holy Land, an additional seven years, because the observance in a foreign country was looked upon as insufficient; and that her house reckoned, in addition to the seven liquids which upon the contact of an unclean person take up and convey the defilement, likewise snow.<sup>2</sup> We leave the historic warrant for this self-righteous glorification to others; but it may be a faithful reminiscence when we are told that Monobaz provided golden handles for the vessels used on the Day of Atonement, and that Helena not only caused the section concerning the woman suspected of adultery (Num. v. 11 *sqq.*), which is to be read on the occasion of the Divine ordeal, to be engraved on a golden tablet (*טבלא של זהב*), but also placed a golden lamp (*כברשל של זהב*) above the entrance of the temple,<sup>3</sup> most likely that which represented a golden vine with gigantic clusters, of which Josephus makes mention, in connection with the description of the Temple in the *Jewish War*, v. 5, § 4, as a splendid piece.

In both Talmuds<sup>4</sup> it is reported that the relatives of

<sup>1</sup> Joseph., *B. J.* ii. 19, § 2; vi. 6, § 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Nazir*, 19b; *Nidda*, 17a.

<sup>3</sup> *Joma*, 37a.

<sup>4</sup> In *Baba bathra*, 11 a of the Babylonian Talmud, and *Pea* i. 1 (*i.e.* Mishra i., Halacha 1) of the Palestinian.



Monobaz protested against his so reckless squandering of the wealth of himself and his fathers, in times of famine. "Thy fathers," they said, have "amassed treasures and augmented those inherited from their fathers; thou squanderest it all." Then he answered, "My fathers have gathered for beneath, and I have gathered for above; my fathers have gathered that over which the hand of man hath power, I that over which no hand of man hath power; my fathers have gathered that which bears no fruit, I that which bears fruit; my fathers have gathered treasures of mammon, I treasures of souls; my fathers have gathered for others, I for myself; my fathers have gathered for this world, I for the world to come."

The post-exilian Judaism has no proselytes to point to who more eminently redound to its praise than these three, Helena, Izates, and Monobaz, in whom was fulfilled by way of example the promise to Jerusalem (Isa. xlix. 23): "Kings shall be thy foster-fathers, and their princesses thy nursing-mothers." Yet it is a sight which possesses no sympathetic attraction for us, when we see those who were originally heathen converted into strict observers of the Jewish ritual law. Then, however, it is true, that fiery judgment had not as yet passed over the temple of the Old Covenant, by which the self-condemnation was completed, which the religion of the Law had pronounced upon itself by the judicial murder accomplished on the Christ of God. Nearly three centuries later came another Helena, the mother of the emperor Constantine, to the Holy Land, who also, like the mother of Izates and Monobaz, visited the holy places there and became a benefactress to the poor. Legend has, equally in a monkish spirit, shed a halo about this Helena, as it did in a Pharisaic spirit about the other. Nevertheless, after deduction of the unhistoric, the two women remain a venerable parallel pair. The one is irradiated by the evening glow of the religion of the Law, and



the other by the morning sunshine of that faith which conquers the world by the love which is the fulfilling of the Law—both winsome types of self-sacrificing love in conformity with the word of God (Gal. vi. 10): "Let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith."

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

---

CRUCIFIED AND RISEN WITH CHRIST.

IN this paper I shall discuss the meaning of a group of phrases familiar to St. Paul, and including the words *crucified, dead, buried, made alive, risen, and sitting in heavenly places, with Christ*. The frequency of these phrases in several Epistles, and the use made in argument of the ideas they convey, reveal the deep hold of these ideas on the mind of the great Apostle. Yet of these phrases and ideas we find in the New Testament outside his Epistles only at most the faintest trace. We may therefore confidently hope that our research will materially help us to understand St. Paul's own personal conception of the way of salvation and of the believer's relation to Christ.

We will first bring together in one view the phrases referred to, and then endeavour to understand them singly and to grasp singly and collectively the conceptions they were designed to convey.

Of these phrases we find no trace in St. Paul's earliest Epistles, those to the Thessalonians. Nor do we find them in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. But in 2 Cor. v. 15 we read, *having judged this, that One died on behalf of all, therefore all died*. This implies that believers, although still living on earth, are yet in some sense already *dead*,

their death being an inference from Christ's death on their behalf. In 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11 we are told that St. Paul's constant and great peril and his deliverance daily from what seemed to be inevitable death was a visible manifestation of the *dying*, and of the resurrection *life, of Jesus*.

Not until we reach the Epistle to the Galatians do we find clearly and fully the phraseology under discussion. In Gal. ii. 20 St. Paul adds, evidently as an explanation, to his foregoing assertion, *I died to law*, the statement *With Christ have I been crucified*. He declares in Gal. v. 24 that *they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires*; and says in chap. vi. 14, *through the cross*<sup>1</sup> of Christ *the world has been crucified to me and I crucified to the world*.

In the Epistle to the Romans the conceptions embodied in these phrases become still more prominent. St. Paul rebuts the idea of continuing in sin by reminding his readers that they *have died to sin*,<sup>2</sup> and can therefore no longer *live in it*. This he explains by pointing to the significance of their baptism, a significance of which they ought not to *be ignorant*. They were *baptized not only for Christ but for His death*.<sup>3</sup> Their baptism was therefore a funeral service. By it they were *buried together with Christ*. The aim of this funeral service, or rather of the death therein implied, was that they might share the life of the Risen Saviour. Of this St. Paul gives proof. Union with Christ in death involves future union with Him in resurrection. Our old selves have been *crucified along with*<sup>4</sup> Christ. We are therefore *dead with Christ*<sup>5</sup> and shall consequently *live with Him*. The Apostle bids his readers reckon themselves to be already, like Christ and in Christ,

<sup>1</sup> Better than *through whom*. For St. Paul is giving a reason why he glories not only in Christ but in His cross. This he explains by saying that by means of that cross himself and the world have been crucified, each to the other.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. vi. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Verse 3.

<sup>4</sup> Verse 6.

<sup>5</sup> Verse 8.

*dead to sin*<sup>1</sup> and *living for God*. In Rom. vii. 4, after comparing believers to a woman set free by death from the law which bound her to her husband, St. Paul declares that *through the crucified body of Christ* his readers have been *put to death to*, i.e. made free from, *the Law*.

Teaching very similar is found in the third group of St. Paul's Epistles, those written during his first captivity. The Colossian Christians were<sup>2</sup> *buried with Christ in baptism*, and already<sup>3</sup> *raised with Him through faith*. They were<sup>4</sup> *dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world*. This element of his teaching the Apostle sums up in one word by saying in chap. iii. 3, *Ye-are-dead*. Since they are also risen<sup>5</sup> with Christ, they are bound to seek, and to care for, only the things at the right hand of God where sits the Risen Saviour.

In what is probably St. Paul's latest Epistle, in 2 Tim. ii. 12, we read: *If we have died with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we endure we shall also reign with Him*.

In short, the Apostle teaches again and again that the great turning points of the human life of Christ have been already reproduced in His servants still living on earth. They are nailed to, and dead upon His cross, buried in His grave, and raised with Him from the grave to the throne of God.

Teaching somewhat different from the above, yet closely related to it, we find in Col. ii. 13, Eph. ii. 1-6. As before, believers are raised together with Christ. But, instead of believers dead with Christ to sin, we have men once dead through their own trespasses, but now, through forgiveness of their trespasses, made alive with Christ, *i.e.* sharers of the life which entered into and raised from the dead His sacred Corpse. In other words, instead of a salutary death with Christ to sin, we have a death without Christ brought

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vi. 11.<sup>2</sup> Col. ii. 11.<sup>3</sup> Verse 12.<sup>4</sup> Col. ii. 20.<sup>5</sup> Col. iii. 1.

about by personal transgressions. The former teaching practically oversteps the interval between death and resurrection, and represents believers simply as dead and risen with Christ, *i.e.* as sharing His deliverance by His own death from the domain of sin, and as sharing also His resurrection life. But now the event of death is left out of sight. The unsaved are found dead. In their grave, amid a dead human race, was laid once the Incarnate Son, Himself slain by the contagion of their sin. But from that grave God raised Him. And together with Christ God has made alive and raised and enthroned in heavenly places also those to whom St. Paul writes.

A line of thought supplementing the above we find in Romans vii. 9-11, where St. Paul speaks of his former state as one of death caused by sin through the instrumentality of the Law. This state of death was, as death always is, preceded by life.

We have thus two similar forms of teaching, each representing believers as risen with Christ, but differing in their conception of the death implied in their resurrection.

Such then is the teaching of St. Paul. We now ask, What does he mean?

The phrases *dead to sin*, *dead from the world*, *crucified to the world*, remind us that death is the most complete separation we can conceive from the world in which the dead one lived. For instance, to the prisoner, while alive, his chains and dungeon are a terrible reality. But the moment he is dead, he is utterly and for ever free from them. Just so, to be dead to sin is to be free from it. Now the believer is dead with Christ,<sup>1</sup> and like Christ,<sup>2</sup> and in Christ.<sup>3</sup> This can only mean that the believer's deliverance from sin results from his relation to Christ, and is like Christ's own deliverance by His own death from

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vi. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

contact with sin. All this we can understand. On the morning of His crucifixion the Saviour was, in consequence of our sins, at the mercy of His enemies. In Gethsemane He groaned under the attack of spiritual foes. In some mysterious sense, and for our sins, He was under the curse<sup>1</sup> of God. But on the evening of the fatal day the Saviour was free. By death He had escaped from all contact with the sin which had brought Him to the cross. Thus was the Crucified One dead<sup>2</sup> to sin. St. Paul teaches that this death to sin is shared by us. This can mean only that through the death of Christ we also are saved from sin.

Similarly, believers are *dead to the Law*.<sup>3</sup> For the Law claims punishment of those who have broken it. And the highest interests of man demand the maintenance of the moral law, *i.e.* the inevitable sequence of sin and punishment. They thus demand the death of the sinner. But St. Paul teaches<sup>4</sup> that God gave Christ to die in order that He might remain just and yet justify the believer. In other words, the justice of God made justification of the believer impossible except through the death of Christ. Now the Law is an embodiment of the justice of God. Therefore, since the death of Christ made pardon of sinners consistent with the justice of God, and therefore possible, through the death of Christ believers have escaped from the Law: they *have been put to death*<sup>5</sup> *to the Law through the crucified body of Christ*. And since all this was in accordance with law, and was therefore a legal process, St. Paul could say, *Through law I died to law*.<sup>6</sup>

Similarly, believers are *crucified to*,<sup>7</sup> and *dead from*,<sup>8</sup> *the world*. To its children, the realm of things around is a tremendous despotism. They are at the mercy of its

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iii. 13.<sup>2</sup> Rom. vi. 10.<sup>3</sup> Rom. vii. 4; Gal. ii. 19.<sup>4</sup> Rom. iii. 26.<sup>5</sup> Rom. vii. 4.<sup>6</sup> Gal. ii. 19.<sup>7</sup> Gal. vi. 14.<sup>8</sup> Col. ii. 20.



smiles and frowns. But he who tastes the liberty with which Christ makes His people free no longer fears the world's frown or courts its smile. Although still living on earth, his relation to the world around is completely changed. And this complete change has come through the death upon the cross which removed Christ from the world in which, during His earthly life, He lived, and to which in some measure He was subject. On that cross, to the believer, the world, his former lord, has died; and himself has died.

Of this separation, by the death of Christ, from the world in which he lived, from the Law which once condemned him, and from sin, the baptism of a believer is an outward and formal recognition. It is therefore akin to a funeral service, which proclaims to the world that a man is dead, and removes him outwardly and formally from all visible contact with the living. To this formal recognition of death, St. Paul appeals when showing the inconsistency of believers continuing in sin.

The words, *If ye have died with Christ*, in 2 Timothy ii. 11, refer probably to martyrdom, as is suggested by the words following, *if ye endure*; or to the disposition of which in certain circumstances the martyr's death is an inevitable outflow. Certainly the martyr drinks<sup>1</sup> of the cup of which Christ drank. For his death, like that of Christ, was caused by the sin of others, was undergone willingly, and for the Kingdom of God. The modes of thought expounded above made it easy for St. Paul to write about martyrdom as possibly already past: *if we have died*. His main assertion is, that they who have laid down their lives for Christ, or are prepared so to do, will share His endless life and royalty: *we shall live with Him and shall reign as kings with Him*.

So far then the Apostle's meaning is clear. Admit once,

<sup>1</sup> Mark x. 38.



as he frequently asserts, that our salvation comes through the death of Christ, and the phraseology before us is correct and appropriate.

Somewhat more difficult is the phrase *dead*<sup>1</sup> *through trespasses and sins*. We ask, In what sense can these words be true?

An answer is suggested by Romans viii. 10, where our mortal bodies are said to be *dead because of sin*. Through the one sin of Adam they are already doomed to the grave. Inevitably they will soon be a prey to worms and corruption. St. Paul therefore overleaps the short interval between the present moment and the moment of death, and speaks of his readers as actually dead. Their death is a result, not of sins, but of *sin*. For the Apostle has already proved that through one man's sin death entered into the world.

In a similar but more tremendous sense, the luxurious one is *dead*<sup>2</sup> even *while living*. For she is already a helpless and hopeless prey of eternal death. The sinner is not dying, but dead. For the dying man is within reach of human help, and while there is life there is hope. But none can save the sinner except the power which called Lazarus from the grave. In this sense, St. Paul's readers were once *dead*. Just as the chief difference between a sleeping and a dead child is that before the one is a prospect of activity and growth, whereas only corruption awaits the other; so before the believer opens a prospect of endless development and blessedness, whereas before the sinner, unless he hears the voice which wakes the dead, lies only eternal corruption.

This mode of representing the condition of the unsaved is the more appropriate because of their comparative insensibility to the eternal realities ever present to the spiritual sense of believers. But this additional coincidence

<sup>1</sup> Eph. ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. v. 6.

is not, so far as I remember, referred to by the Apostle; and must not be pressed.

The teaching that the unsaved are *dead* is, in John v. 24, traced to the lips of Christ: *He that believeth . . . is passed out of death into life.* Compare also His words in Matt. viii. 22: *Leave the dead to bury their own dead.*

Notice that the sinner's eternal death is caused, not by one *sin*, as in the death of the body, but by his own *trespasses and sins*. For of these personal sins eternal death is the punishment.

This death through sins was caused by the revival of sin<sup>1</sup> consequent on the coming of the commandment. As in the days of childhood Saul of Tarsus heard from his parents' lips the Law of God, the inborn power of sin, dormant hitherto, woke up into new life, and led him into actual sins. These personal sins brought him under condemnation of the Law, and thus separated him from the only real life. In this sense, *sin . . . through the commandment slew him.*

The foregoing has made quite clear also in what sense believers are *made alive*<sup>2</sup> with Christ. To a man condemned to die, pardon is life. So St. Paul says, "*He hath made you alive with Him, having forgiven us all trespasses.*"<sup>3</sup> This phraseology is the more appropriate because forgiveness is accompanied by the gift of the Spirit of God, who enters into the believer and becomes in him the animating principle of a new immortal life and the source of new perceptions and activities. For believers both<sup>4</sup> *live and walk by the Spirit.* The absence of this spirit of life is a mark of spiritual death.

Again, had not the breath of life re-entered the cold and still body of the Crucified, there had been no saving faith in Him and no Christian life. Consequently, the act of Divine mercy which breathed into us a new life was a result and a further development of the mercy to our race which brought

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Eph. ii. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Col. ii. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Gal. v. 25.

back to life the dead Saviour. In this sense St. Peter<sup>1</sup> could say that *God begat us again through resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead*; and St. Paul,<sup>2</sup> that *He made us alive together with Christ*. For our immortal life is a participation of the life given on the first Easter morning to His lifeless body.

A difficult question remains. In what sense are believers *risen*<sup>3</sup> *with Christ*, and *enthroned*<sup>4</sup> *with Him in heavenly places*? We must find for these words a meaning which will justify their use, and justify also St. Paul's exhortation to seek the things where the Risen One is, and his assertion that this resurrection with Christ is through belief of the working of God who raised Him from the dead.

We have already seen that St. Paul frequently teaches that the great turning-points in the human life of Christ are already reproduced in the spiritual experience of His servants on earth. That these turning-points will be reproduced in them, is at once evident. The servants will follow their Master into the grave, and from the grave: like Him they will rise to heaven, and will sit with Him upon His throne. Now their descent into the grave is in no way a result of His descent; and therefore cannot be described as a death with Him. That phrase St. Paul reserves for an inward and spiritual experience. But their future resurrection and enthronement will be direct results of His resurrection and enthronement. Had He not risen, no resurrection would now await them. Consequently, our final victory over death will be a result of His victory already gained. Moreover, our enthronement will be a share of His glory: *He shall sit with Me in My throne*.<sup>5</sup> On that Day of Days, as we sit with Christ in endless life, while the things of earth are but a memory of a retreating past, and look back to the empty grave in Joseph's garden,

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. i. 3.<sup>2</sup> Eph. ii. 5.<sup>3</sup> Col. ii. 12; iii. 1.<sup>4</sup> Eph. ii. 6.<sup>5</sup> Rev. iii. 21.

it will be easy to overleap the interval between that first victory and our own faith in Christ, and the interval between our first faith and this our final victory, and to say, That first victory was my victory, the mercy and power which on that day raised Him raised me also to this life and glory in which I now reign with the Risen One. We might therefore correctly say, We shall rise and sit with Christ.

Now a conspicuous feature of St. Paul's thought is an intense realisation of the future, making it present and actual. In some degree this is common to us all. If a future event be certain to us, it exerts upon us the influence of present actuality. A man who is sure that in a short time abundant wealth will come to him is looked upon by himself and others as already rich. He looks at everything, and forms his plans, from the standpoint of the wealth he will soon receive. Practically, and in human thought and language, he is already rich. So St. Paul on earth, as he looked forward with sure confidence to the glory awaiting him, as he enjoyed day by day close companionship with the enthroned Saviour, and felt in his own breast the pulse of immortal life, forgot the interval between his own day and the day of Christ's return, and the distance between earth and heaven; and, remembering that his own future resurrection was a direct result of Christ's past resurrection, spoke of himself as already risen from the dead and seated with Christ. Remembering also that this glorious certainty is shared by all who believe the Gospel, he includes his readers in his assertions, and declares that they, like himself, were already risen with Christ. Elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> he speaks of those predestined to the likeness of Christ as already *glorified*. Of this assertion, the statement that their bodies are already *dead*<sup>2</sup> is the dark counterfoil.

Such then is the important meaning of St. Paul's re-

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 10.

markable words. All the unsaved are, through their own sins, already dead: for they are, in the just judgment of God, already beyond human help, a prey to eternal corruption. From this death believers have been set free by forgiveness of their sins, and by inspiration of the Divine Spirit of life, a forgiveness and inspiration impossible had not life returned into the lifeless body of Christ. In another and opposite sense believers are dead. For their old life has come to an end. They are sharers with Christ in the deliverance wrought by His own death upon the cross. They will share His resurrection and enthronement, and to their confident hope this future glory is a present reality.

In another paper I shall discuss, in the light of the phrases now before us and of the thoughts therein embodied, the place in St. Paul's thought of the historic facts of the Death and Resurrection of Christ.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

## THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

### IV.

“Whom I have sent back to thee in his own person, that is, my very heart: whom I would fain have kept with me, that in thy behalf he might minister unto me in the bonds of the gospel: but without thy mind I would do nothing; that thy goodness should not be as of necessity, but of free will.”—PHILEM. 12-14 (Rev. Ver.).

THE characteristic features of the Epistle are all embodied in these verses. They set forth, in the most striking manner, the relation of Christianity to slavery and to other social evils. They afford an exquisite example of the courteous delicacy and tact of the Apostle's intervention on behalf of Onesimus; and there shine through them, as through a semi-transparent medium, adumbrations and shimmering hints of the greatest truths of Christianity.

I. The first point to notice is that decisive step of sending



back the fugitive slave. Not many years ago the conscience of England was stirred because the Government of the day sent out a circular instructing captains of men-of-war, on the decks of which fugitive slaves sought asylum, to restore them to their "owners." Here an Apostle does the same thing—seems to side with the oppressor, and to drive the oppressed from the sole refuge left him, the horns of the very altar. More extraordinary still, here is the fugitive voluntarily going back, travelling all the weary way from Rome to Colossæ in order to put his neck once more beneath the yoke. Both men were acting from Christian motives, and thought that they were doing a piece of plain Christian duty. Then does Christianity sanction slavery? Certainly not; its principles cut it up by the roots. A gospel, of which the starting point is that all men stand on the same level, as loved by the one Lord, and redeemed by the one cross, can have no place for such an institution. A religion which attaches the highest importance to man's awful prerogative of freedom, because it insists on every man's individual responsibility to God, can keep no terms with a system which turns men into chattels. Therefore Christianity cannot but regard slavery as a sin against God, and as treason towards man. The principles of the gospel worked into the conscience of a nation destroy slavery. Historically it is true that as Christianity has grown slavery has withered. But the New Testament never directly condemns it, and by regulating the conduct of Christian masters, and recognising the obligations of Christian slaves, seems to contemplate its continuance, and to be deaf to the sighing of the captives.

This attitude was probably not a piece of policy, or a matter of calculated wisdom on the part of the Apostle. He no doubt saw that the Gospel brought a great unity in which all distinctions were merged, and rejoiced in thinking that "in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free"; but



whether he expected the distinction ever to disappear from actual life is less certain. He may have thought of slavery as he did of sex, that the fact would remain, while yet "we are all one in Christ Jesus." It is by no means necessary to suppose that the Apostles saw the full bearing of the truths they had to preach, in their relation to social conditions. They were inspired to give the Church the principles. It remained for future ages, under Divine guidance, to apprehend the destructive and formative range of these principles.

However this may be, the attitude of the New Testament to slavery is the same as to other unchristian institutions. It brings the leaven, and lets it work. That attitude is determined by three great principles. First, the message of Christianity is primarily to individuals, and only secondarily to society. It leaves the units whom it has influenced to influence the mass. Second, it acts on spiritual and moral sentiment, and only afterwards and consequently on deeds or institutions. Third, it hates violence, and trusts wholly to enlightened conscience. So it meddles directly with no political or social arrangements, but lays down principles which will profoundly affect these, and leaves them to soak into the general mind. If an evil needs force for its removal, it is not ready for removal. If it has to be pulled up by violence, a bit of the root will certainly be left and will grow again. When a dandelion head is ripe, a child's breath can detach the winged seeds; but until it is, no tempest can move them. The method of violence is noisy and wasteful, like the winter torrents that cover acres of good ground with mud and rocks, and are past in a day. The only true way is, by slow degrees, to create a state of feeling which shall instinctively abhor and cast off the evil. There will be no hubbub and no waste, and the thing once done will be done for ever.

So has it been with slavery; so will it be with war, and intemperance, and impurity, and the miserable anomalies

of our present civilization. It has taken eighteen hundred years for the whole Church to learn the inconsistency of Christianity with slavery. We are no quicker learners than the past generations were. God is patient, and does not seek to hurry the march of His purposes. We have to be imitators of God, and shun the "raw haste" which is "half-sister to delay."

But patience is not passivity. It is a Christian's duty to "hasten the day of the Lord," and to take part in the educational process which Christ is carrying on through the ages, by submitting himself to it in the first place, and then by endeavouring to bring others under its influence. His place should be in the van of all social progress. It does not become Christ's servants to be content with the attainments of any past or present, in the matter of the organization of society on Christian principles. "God has more light to break forth from His word." Coming centuries will look back on the obtuseness of the moral perceptions of nineteenth century Christians in regard to matters of Christian duty which, hidden from us, are sun-clear to them, with the same half-amused, half-tragic wonder with which we look back to Jamaica planters or South Carolina rice growers, who defended slavery as a missionary institution, and saw no contradiction between their religion and their practice. We have to stretch our charity to believe in these men's sincere religion. Succeeding ages will have to make the same allowance for us, and will need it for themselves from their successors. The main thing is, for us to try to keep our spirits open to all the incidence of the gospel on social and civic life, and to see that we are on the right side, and trying to help on the approach of that kingdom which does "not cry, nor lift up, nor cause its voice to be heard in the streets," but has its coming "prepared as the morning," that swims up, silent and slow, and flushes the heaven with an unsetting light.

II. The next point in these verses is Paul's loving identification of himself with Onesimus.

The A.V. here follows another reading from the R.V., the former has "thou therefore receive him, that is, mine own bowels." The additional words are unquestionably inserted without authority in order to patch a broken construction. The R.V. cuts the knot in a different fashion by putting the abrupt words, "himself" that is, my very own "heart," under the government of the preceding verb. But it seems more probable that the Apostle began a new sentence with them, which he meant to have finished as the A.V. does for him, but which, in fact, got hopelessly upset in the swift rush of his thoughts, and does not right itself grammatically till the "receive him" of *v.* 17.

In any case the main thing to observe is the affectionate plea which he puts in for cordial reception of Onesimus. Of course "mine own bowels" is simply the Hebrew way of saying "mine own heart." We think the one phrase graceful and sentimental, and the other coarse. A Jew did not think so, and it might be difficult to say why he should. It is a mere question of difference in localizing certain emotions. Onesimus was a piece of Paul's very heart, part of himself; the unprofitable slave had wound himself round his affections, and become so dear that to part with him was like cutting his heart out of his bosom. Perhaps some of the virtues, which the servile condition helps to develop in undue proportion, such as docility, lightheartedness, serviceableness, had made him a soothing and helpful companion; what a plea that would be with one who loved Paul as well as Philemon did! He could not receive harshly one whom the Apostle had so honoured with his love. "Take care of him, be kind to him, as if it were to me."

Such language from an Apostle about a slave would do more to destroy slavery than any violence would do. Love

leaps the barrier, and it ceases to separate. So these simple, heart-felt words are an instance of one method by which Christianity wars against all social wrongs, by casting its caressing arm around the outcast, and showing that the abject and oppressed are objects of its special love.

They teach too how interceding love makes its object part of its very self; the same thought recurs still more distinctly in *v.* 17, "Receive him as myself." It is the natural language of love; some of the deepest and most blessed Christian truths are but the carrying out of that identification to its fullest extent. We are all Christ's Onesimuses, and He, out of His pure love, makes Himself one with us, and us one with Him; the union of Christ with all who trust in Him, no doubt, presupposes His Divine nature, but still there is a human side to it, and it is the result of His perfect love. All love delights to fuse itself with its object, and as far as may be to abolish the distinction of "I" and "thou." But human love can travel but a little way on that road; Christ's goes much farther. He that pleads for some poor creature feels that the kindness is done to himself when the former is helped or pardoned. Imperfectly but really these words shadow forth the great fact of Christ's intercession for us sinners, and our acceptance in Him. We need no better symbol of the stooping love of Christ, who identifies Himself with His brethren, and of our wondrous identification with Him, our High Priest and Intercessor, than this picture of the Apostle pleading for the runaway and bespeaking a welcome for him as part of himself. When Paul says, "Receive him, that is, my very heart," his words remind us of yet more blessed ones, which reveal a deeper love and more marvellous condescension, "He that receiveth you receiveth Me," and may reverently be taken as a faint shadow of that prevailing intercession, through which he that is joined to the Lord and is one spirit with Him, is received of God as

part of Christ's mystical body, bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh.

III. Next comes the expression of a half-formed purpose which was put aside for a reason to be immediately stated. "I would fain have kept with me"; the tense of the verb indicating the incompleteness of the desire. The very statement of it is turned into a graceful expression of Paul's confidence in Philemon's goodwill to him, by the addition of that "on thy behalf." He is sure that, if his friend had been beside him, he would have been glad to lend him his servant, and so he would have liked to have had Onesimus as a kind of representative of the service which he knows would have been so willingly rendered. The purpose for which he would have liked to keep him is defined as being, "that he might minister to me in the bonds of the gospel." If the last words be connected with "me," they suggest a tender reason why Paul should be ministered to, as suffering for Christ, their common Master, and for the truth, their common possession. If, as is perhaps less probable, they be connected with "minister," they describe the sphere in which the service is to be rendered. Either the master or the slave would be bound by the obligations which the gospel laid on them to serve Paul. Both were his converts, and therefore knit to him by a welcome chain, which made service a delight.

There is no need to enlarge on the winning courtesy of these words, so full of happy confidence in the friend's disposition, that they could not but evoke the love to which they trusted so completely. Nor need I do more than point their force for the purpose of the whole letter, the procuring a cordial reception for the returning fugitive. So dear had he become, that Paul would like to have kept him. He goes back with a kind of halo round him, now that he is not only a good-for-nothing runaway, but Paul's friend, and so much prized by him. It would be impossible to do any-



thing but welcome him, bringing such credentials; and yet all this is done with scarcely a word of direct praise, which might have provoked contradiction. One does not know whether the confidence in Onesimus or in Philemon is the dominant note in the harmony. In the preceding clause, he was spoken of as, in some sense, part of the Apostle's very self. In this, he is regarded as, in some sense, part of Philemon. So he is a link between them. Paul would have taken his service as if it had been his master's. Can the master fail to take him as if he were Paul?

IV. The last topic in these verses is the decision which arrested the half-formed wish. "I was *wishing* indeed, but I *willed* otherwise." The language is exact. There is a universe between "I wished," and "I willed." Many a good wish remains fruitless, because it never passes into the stage of firm resolve. Many who wish to be better will be bad. One strong "I will" can paralyse a million wishes.

The Apostle's final determination was, to do nothing without Philemon's cognisance and consent. The reason for the decision is at once a very triumph of persuasiveness, which would be ingenious if it were not so spontaneous, and an adumbration of the very spirit of Christ's appeal for service to us. "That thy benefit"—the good done to me by him, which would in my eyes be done by you—"should not be as of necessity, but willingly." That "as" is a delicate addition. He will not think that the benefit would really have been by constraint, but it might have looked as if it were.

Do not these words go much deeper than this small matter? And did not Paul learn the spirit that suggested them from his own experience of how Christ treated him? The principle underlying them is, that where the bond is love, compulsion takes the sweetness and goodness out of even sweet and good things. Freedom is essential to virtue. If a man "could not help it" there is neither praise nor



blame due. That freedom Christianity honours and respects. So in reference to the offer of the gospel blessings, men are not forced to accept them, but appealed to, and can turn deaf ears to the pleading voice, "Why will ye die?" Sorrows and sins and miseries without end continue, and the gospel is rejected, and lives of wretched godlessness lived, and a dark future pulled down on the rejecters' heads—and all because God knows that these things are better than that men should be forced into goodness, which indeed would cease to be goodness if they were. For nothing is good but the free turning of the will to goodness, and nothing bad but its aversion therefrom.

The same solemn regard for the freedom of the individual and low estimate of the worth of constrained service influence the whole aspect of Christian ethics. Christ wants no pressed men in His army. The victorious host of priestly warriors, which the Psalmist saw following the priest-king in the day of his power, numerous as the dew drops, and radiant with reflected beauty as these, were all "willing"—volunteers. There are no conscripts in the ranks. These words might be said to be graven over the gates of the kingdom of heaven, "Not as of necessity, but willingly." In Christian morals, law becomes love, and love, law. "Must" is not in the Christian vocabulary, except as expressing the sweet constraint which bows the will of him who loves to harmony, which is joy, with the will of Him who is loved. Christ takes no offerings which the giver is not glad to render. Money, influence, service, which are not offered by a will moved by love, which love, in its turn, is set in motion by the recognition of the infinite love of Christ in His sacrifice, are, in His eyes, nought. An earthenware cup with a drop of cold water in it, freely given out of a glad heart, is richer and more precious in His sight than golden chalices swimming with wine and melted pearls, which are laid by constraint on His table. "I

delight to do Thy will" is the foundation of all Christian obedience; and the servant had caught the very tone of the Lord's voice, when he said, "Without thy mind I will do nothing, that thy benefit should not be, as it were, of necessity, but willingly."

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE  
NEW TESTAMENT.

OF books bearing more or less directly upon exposition we have received the following: *Lessons of the Cross and Passion*, etc. Four courses of Lent Lectures by C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Dean of Llandaff (Macmillan & Co., 1886), of which nothing need be said but that it maintains that steady uniformity of excellence which the writer by his previous thirty volumes of sermons has led us to expect. All are at the same level, "not too bright or good for human nature's daily food," but remarkable for instinctive correctness of exposition, unaffected devoutness, and purity of style. The four courses are on "Lessons of the Cross and Passion," "Words from the Cross," "The Reign of Sin," and "The Lord's Prayer." *The Parables of our Saviour Expounded and Illustrated*, by William M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1887) is also by a writer too well-known to require much commendation. This is however the best book we have had from Dr. Taylor. The subject gives scope to his expository insight and geniality. The writer's broad common-sense frees the Parables from the over-refinements of commentators, and grasps the definite lesson of each. It is a fresh and stimulating volume, sure to be prized by preachers. *Seven, the Sacred Number: its Use in Scripture and its Application to Biblical Criticism*, by Richard Samuel (Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887), is a laborious but ill-advised attempt to show that questions of Canonicity, Textual Criticism, and Interpretation can be settled if we believe that every writer of Scripture had an eye to a symmetrical arrangement of his words and paragraphs in sevens. *Astrology in the Apocalypse*, by W. Gershom Collingwood, M.A. (George Allen, Sunnyside, Orpington, 1886), is a short essay on the traces of Chaldean astrology in

the Bible. Most readers will shrink from some of Mr. Collingwood's interpretations; but undoubtedly he makes out a case which is *primô facie* plausible and worthy of consideration. The coincidences between the characters of the seven Churches addressed in the book of Revelation and the attributes of the seven planets are at all events curious; and Mr. Collingwood's suggestions have as much foundation as most interpretations of the Apocalypse. The translation of the *Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide* is now edited by G. Gould Ross, D.C.L., and the present issue (Hodges, 1887), the 6th volume, contains the Gospel of Luke. The commentary is learned, intelligent, and full. Here and there the theological bias of the author appears. To some, its chief merit will be that it contains many admirable quotations from patristic writers, while he himself is never prolix or pointless. A second edition of *The Parousia* (Fisher Unwin, 1887) gives the name of the hitherto anonymous author, J. Stuart Russell, M.A. The theory of this able and scholarly volume is, that the destruction of Jerusalem satisfied the predictions of our Lord and His Apostles regarding His second coming. "It was an event which has no parallel in history. It was the outward and visible sign of a great epoch in the Divine government of the world. It was the close of one dispensation and the commencement of another." The obvious objections to this idea are frankly considered by the author; and though few will agree with his main thesis, all will be instructed by his discussion of the leading predictions in the New Testament. The volume is indispensable for a student of prophecy or of expository literature. *Palestine in the Time of Christ*, by Edmond Stapfer, D.D., Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris, translated by Annie H. Holmden (Hodder and Stoughton, 1886), is a kind of book for which there is always room. It contains a full account of the social, political, and religious condition of the Jews in the time of our Lord, and supplies a great deal of information without which the New Testament cannot be understood. It does not supersede Sehürer and Hausrath; but in point of accuracy it bears comparison with these standard writers, and its form will introduce it where bulkier books are excluded. No book of recent publication can so confidently be recommended to teachers of all grades, and generally to intelligent readers. It should find a place in every study.

## THE PROPHET AMOS.

### II. THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.

In a former paper it was observed that the prophet's doctrine of Jehovah was a very elevated one. Jehovah, in the prophet's conception of Him, was a self-conscious Person, for He swore by Himself; He was all-powerful, His name was not the God of Israel, but the Lord of hosts; He not only possessed all power, but wielded it, being creator of all that exists in heaven and on earth, Orion and the Pleiades, the mountains and the wind, and being the mover in all the changes which we observe, turning the darkness into morning and making the day dark with night, giving and withholding rain, sending mildew, pestilence, overthrow, and earthquake. Further, He not only commanded the material forces of the universe, He ruled equally among the nations of the earth, bringing them from their ancient seats to new habitations, and sending them back again to whence they came, the nations around Israel as well as Israel; and even directing the powerful Assyrian, and making him the rod of His anger to afflict Israel from the northern border to the south, and to execute His judgments upon the nations who disregarded the common laws of humanity, whether in regard to Israel or among themselves: and His power was an all-pervading one, operating to effect His righteous ends in the top of Carmel and in the bottom of the sea, in hell and heaven. It is however upon the ethical or spiritual nature of Jehovah that the prophet chiefly insists. He upholds the law of righteousness and humanity, which is common to Himself and to men. To this is due that He

must chastise the nations and Israel alike, the latter doubly. And for the same reason all service of Him to be acceptable must be spiritual, that is, mental. Sacrifices of flesh are inappreciable to Him; He and they are incommensurable. It is interesting to know for certain that this teaching is as old as the first half of the eighth century. It is not uncommon teaching in the Old Testament, being found in the Psalms as well as in the prophets (Ps. xl. and l.); but the date of any psalm can hardly ever be fixed. Historical tradition lifts the doctrine into a much greater antiquity, putting it into the mouth of Samuel: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord?" (1 Sam. xv. 22.)

Though this prophet insists most on the idea of the Divine righteousness, and on a righteous life as true service of Him—"I will not smell in your solemn assemblies, but let righteousness run down your streets like water,"—it would be a mistake to suppose that Jehovah is a mere impersonated justice, or that righteousness among men is but a cold giving to every man his due. Jehovah is also good, for He brought up Israel from Egypt, and He raised up among the people prophets and Nazarites. He is not only good to Israel, He is compassionate: twice, in other words, many times, He repented Him of the evil He thought to do to Israel, and averted His judgment, moved by the consideration that Jacob was small (chap. vii.); and it is His pity for the poor of His people that sees so great an offence in the oppression of them by the rich. Neither is righteousness among men a mere cold civil or judicial rectitude of conduct. It embraces consideration for the poverty of the poor, for the sorrow of the wretched, for the human feelings of mankind in all their compass. It is no doubt interesting to observe the leading conceptions of particular prophets, what strikes them as the great attribute or characteristic of Jehovah's being, and corre-



sponding to this, what should be the great feature of men's service of Him; yet we are in danger when generalizing in this way of making particular prophets the exponents of merely a single conception, and failing to observe the many other conceptions, which, though less prominent, are present, either expressed or suggested. It is the manner of one writer to teach or suggest by examples, while another expresses his idea explicitly; but it may not always be a just inference that the second makes an advance upon the first. Amos says in Jehovah's name: "Also I brought you up out of Egypt, and led you forty years in the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite" (ii. 10), leaving the action to appeal to men's minds and suggest the affection in the mind of the Lord which prompted it; while Hosea speaks explicitly: "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt" (xi. 1). Amos denounces those who sell the poor for money, leaving the denunciation to suggest to those who heard him that humanity should characterize their treatment of one another; but Hosea has the word that expresses the positive idea: "There is no truth nor mercy (*hesed*), humanity or goodness, in the land." Again Amos says: "I hate, I despise your feasts; go to Bethel, and transgress," leaving it to be inferred that Jehovah was altogether another from the people's conception of Him; while Hosea says plainly, "There is no knowledge of God in the land; I desire goodness and not sacrifices." The task of biblical theology is an exceedingly delicate one. The passion of the human mind is for distinctions and classification. Broad distinctions are rare in the Old Testament. The course of revelation is like a river, which cannot be cut up into sections. The springs at least of all prophecy can be seen in the two prophets of northern Israel; but the rains which fed those fountains fell in the often unrecorded past.

Corresponding to the idea of Jehovah is the idea of the



People. It is the god that makes the people; its unity lies in its having a god. The two conceptions are correlative, but in Israel at least the idea of God is the formative idea. Its God is not a reflection of its national spirit; on the contrary, its consciousness is expressed in the favourite figure of the clay and the potter (Jer. xviii.). Jehovah is the framer of Israel, and the mould in which He casts it is that of His own nature, the image He impresses on it is His own. Historical investigators are never weary asking where or when or how Israel came by its conception of Jehovah; but they fail to elicit an answer from history. They construe the history of Israel with the view of showing how its various turns must have suggested to the people the ideas which they had of their God. In this however they directly traverse the consciousness of the people as reflected in their Scriptures; for this consciousness persistently inverts the order of the evolutionists, and always explains events by the conception of Jehovah already possessed. And this is as true of the exodus as it is of the exile. The history of Israel ran a course very much like the histories of other peoples. The nation began as a confederacy of tribes, consolidated into a monarchy, split into divisions, and fell a natural prey to the great eastern empires. Other states did the same. The institutions of Israel, such as the monarchy or the priesthood, were just the institutions of the neighbouring peoples. The people was a Shemitic people, amidst others of the same family. How came Israel to entertain such exalted notions of its monarchy as we find in Isaiah vii.-xi., or of itself as a people in opposition to other peoples, as we find in Isaiah xlii., xlix.? What is the *differentia* in its consciousness from the mind of other nations? It cannot be doubted that it is the conception of Jehovah its God. This is the source of the whole of that imperishable ideal element which Israel contributed to Christianity and to the perfect religion

of mankind. Its institutions had little in them peculiar; what gave them meaning was something anterior to them, something which already lay in the mind of the nation, and which it brought to the institutions or to the events, and which transfigured them. The kingship in Israel had nothing in it of itself to awaken such thoughts as we find connected with it, any more than the kingship in Moab. It was the preliminary thought that Jehovah was the people's King, and the human king His representative, on whom lay His glory, that gave the monarchy its elevation, and struck an ideal which found no satisfying limit short of making the representative king in some way an embodiment of Jehovah Himself—"God with us." And what made the people, or the prophets speaking for them, put forward the extraordinary pretensions above other peoples which they made was the consciousness that they were the people of Jehovah. It is always difficult to argue about God or gods, unless we assume more than we are entitled in argument to assume. When we speak of God or gods we mean the conception of God entertained by the people. Israel's thoughts of Jehovah their God were such that the fact of their being His people raised them, to their own minds, above all the nations of the world, and gave them a place in the history of the human mind that was unique. Jehovah's word incarnated in the flesh of the seed of Abraham was the Servant of the Lord, who should bring forth judgment to the nations. The self-consciousness of the religion of Israel is a phenomenon almost more singular than the religion itself. And this self-consciousness is reflected more vividly already in the prophecies of Balaam (of whatever age they may be) than even in the second half of Isaiah; for Isaiah has still to argue with heathenism, but Balaam, the prophet of heathendom itself, acknowledges the uniqueness of Israel and its God.

The prophet Amos appeared at Bethel some time in the

reign of Jeroboam II., before the middle of the eighth century. The northern kingdom reached its highest splendour under the second Jeroboam. His long reign gave his great talents scope, and afforded time for his enterprises to consolidate. Along with great energy and military ability he appears also to have had self-control. In matters of ritual the usual verdict is passed on him, that he "did evil in the sight of the Lord." But men of great talents are not usually altogether destitute of reverence for the truth, and, whatever his motives were, he does not seem to have allowed himself to be drawn by the representations of his priest at Bethel to take any measures against the prophet. At an earlier period the preaching of Amos would have been a more dangerous thing than it appeared now. The history of Israel contained many examples of the power of the prophets to overthrow dynasties, and the priest of Bethel craftily recalled this fact when he said, "Amos has conspired against thee." But prophecy had undergone a change; the two last prophets of Israel no more use political weapons, but rely altogether on the power of the word of God. Whether the king perceived this or not, so far as he was concerned the prophet appears to have been unmolested. The time was one of great outward prosperity. The arms of Jeroboam had been successful everywhere; the old enemies of Israel had been defeated, and the old boundaries of the kingdom restored. Peace reigned, and with peace security. Men were at ease in Zion, and confident on the mountain of Samaria. Distant rumours of a mighty power operating on the Euphrates and coming into collision with Syria were too vague to cause alarm; the politicians were too glass-eyed to perceive that the barrier of the Syrian kingdom once broken by the Assyrian, nothing lay between them and that irresistible power. The prophet alone perceived it, and foretold that the kingdom of the North would speedily fall before the Assyrian invader.

Two or three things which the prophet refers to give us some insight into the religious condition of the country, and certain other things mentioned by him cast light on its civil and social state.

The worship of the North was not pure worship of Jehovah, but it was not strictly idolatry. It was worship of Jehovah under sensuous forms, mixed no doubt with many Canaanitish impurities, especially at the rural high places, and too often with conceptions of Jehovah which were proper rather to Baal than to Him. It is not quite certain how the calf-worship originated, whether it had its origin in Egypt, or was an old premosaic superstition revived, or had been borrowed from the Canaanites. Nor is it quite certain whether the calf or young bull was considered a representation of Jehovah in His whole nature, or only a symbol of some of His attributes. Such a worship, though impure, was different from formal Baal worship; though corrupt, it was not absolutely false. And one can imagine from the example of the Christian Church in many ages that there may have been real virtue and piety in spite of it in many hearts in the northern kingdom. Although religious opinions be the food on which religious life is supported, the latter has, like the natural life, the power of assimilating what is healthy, and rejecting what is hurtful. On many the corrupt doctrines of the Church in the middle ages exerted but little deteriorating influence; the religious taste instinctively put aside what was noxious. It is possible that to some minds in Israel the symbol of the calf had little significance; that, just as real corruptions, like saint worship, lose their meaning, and pass in process of time into mere æsthetic representation or adornment on sacred edifices, to many the images of the calves had little more meaning than the brazen bulls in Solomon's temple. Among the mass however this would by no means be the case, and in process of time the evil, as its manner is, overmastered the counteracting good.

As Amos represents the national mind of his day, it was very religious. The worship at the high places, and particularly at the national temple at Bethel, was sedulously practised with much outward impressiveness and eagerness on the part of the worshippers. Men were ready with free-will offerings in addition to those prescribed by law or custom. The stated feasts were carefully kept. Tithes were paid every three years, and sabbaths and new moons observed. As at Jerusalem, the service was accompanied with sacred music: "Take away from Me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols" (v. 23). Men thought they were worshipping Jehovah. And there may have been true worshippers among them. Some pious hands may have helped to rear those altars, and some devout hearts may have bowed before them. It is always difficult to say what amount of corruption is needed to invalidate religious service. Corruptions that are hereditary and practised without anything better being known do not at least hurt the conscience like those into which men have of themselves declined. Nevertheless sin, even when unconscious, is sin. The sore at the heart of the people could not but affect all parts of the body. The sun that holds in equipoise the moral system of human life is God. As St. Paul teaches, the fountain of all evils is ungodliness. When men corrupt the image of God in their hearts, they forthwith proceed to the debasing of themselves, and then to such enmity and strife that the bonds of society are wholly broken. The law is illustrated in the history of northern Israel, though perhaps it was not till Hosea's days that full evidence of it appeared.

Some other conceptions of the people are referred to by the prophet which throw light upon their religious condition. He represents them as trusting to the fact that they were the people of Jehovah, and therefore as desiring the coming of the day of the Lord. The "day of the Lord" is one of



the most prominent prophetic conceptions. Some prophetic books, as that of Zephaniah, are little else than an expansion of the idea. In others it occupies a less prominent place, though it appears in very many.

This day was the day of Jehovah's interference, when He would manifest Himself as that which He truly was, when He would grasp the reins of rule, and bring to manifestation His purposes. At many times He seemed a God that hid Himself; on the day of the Lord men would behold His full revelation, and He would perform His work, His strange work. Some writers make the representation that the day of the Lord denotes any great calamity or judgment, and they speak of "a day of the Lord." This is no doubt a misinterpretation of prophecy. To the prophets the day of the Lord was an *à priori* religious presentiment, a moral necessity and certainty. They do not identify it with any calamity or judgment, or any particular and actual event. These calamities are at most the tokens and signals of its nearness, or no doubt such judgments sometimes accompany it. The day of the Lord is something universal and final, and never a mere crisis that may pass over. At one time the moral situation is such that the interference of Jehovah and the day of the Lord seem a necessity (Isa. ii.-iii.); at another time the judgments that afflict the community, or the great convulsions that shake society, suggest the presence of Jehovah: men seem to hear the sound of His goings through history, and the presentiment of His perfect revelation of Himself as at hand fills their minds (Joel ii., Isa. xiii.). Of course the world passes through the storm, and the day of the Lord is deferred. But this does not entitle us to denude the idea of its true significance, and reduce the day of the Lord to any merely temporary crisis, or to imagine that any prophet ever used the phrase in this attenuated sense. In the prophet Amos we meet with the idea of the day of the Lord for the first time, but the idea

was not new in his days. It was already a popular conception. Such a profound moral conception can hardly have originated in the mind of the Hebrew populace, or that populace was very different from modern representations of it. The prophet treats the popular notion of that "day" as a delusion: "Wherefore will ye have the day of the Lord? The day of the Lord is evil, and not good; darkness, and not light. It is as if a man fled from a lion, and a bear met him." He treats as equally a delusion the people's confidence in Jehovah's protection because they are His people. Other prophets have to meet the same delusion: "They shall cry unto Me, My God, we Israel know Thee"; to which the Lord responds with scornful accentuation of the term Israel: "Israel hath cast off good; let the foe pursue him" (Hos. viii.). The usual explanation of such ideas on the part of Israel is, that they are nothing but the expression of the natural confidence of a people in its national god, who, being its god, was naturally thought better and stronger than other gods. The explanation is hardly satisfactory. There seem reminiscences and echoes in this language of the people, superficial as it was in their mouths, of meanings more profound. The phrases they use are not their own, they have been taught them, or have inherited them; and those who first gave them currency used them in a deeper sense and with a better knowledge of what Jehovah was.

The information which the prophet affords regarding the social condition of the people is remarkable. The sin which he reprobates most severely is the injustice of one class to another, and the oppression of the poor by those above them. "They sell the righteous for money; . . . they pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor." It is not quite easy to understand the laws relating to land and debt in Israel, nor how it was that oppression was so rife. According to the idea, each tribe and each

family or clan had its own possession. The land was the Lord's and was held of Him; it was the portion given by Him to those who held it, and was inalienable. If for any temporary reason it passed out of the hand of the proper owner it was always redeemable for money, and at the year of jubilee it returned free. Such temporary transfers of land probably occurred frequently, and mainly on account of debt. The debtor in Israel appears to have been legally defenceless, though many exhortations are given to the people to use mildness and show brotherly feeling in their treatment of the poor. The chief want in Israel, as in the East generally, was probably not so much the want of laws or customs as the want of an upright executive to put them in operation. Micah complains that the prince asketh money, and the judge asketh for a bribe, and the great man uttereth his mischievous desire, and so they pervert it (vii. 3). When Amos prophesied at Bethel the country had long been scourged by expensive and exhausting wars. The protracted feuds with the Syrians had drained into the army the smaller yeomen in great numbers; their fields and vineyards probably remained without due cultivation; if they returned, they were impoverished, and fell into the hands of creditors. The prophet mentions some other things that must have been disastrous to the agricultural population, as droughts: "I have withholden the rain from you, when it was yet three months to harvest" (iv. 7); and failure of crops: "I have smitten you with blasting and mildew." The land probably in many cases changed hands. From being owners multitudes became hirelings. The law of restitution at the fiftieth year was a good law, but those who were entrusted with its administration were not good. The tenacity with which men clung to their paternal inheritance is illustrated in the case of Naboth, who refused an excambion even to the king; but the nefarious stratagem which the latter permitted himself to employ in order to

dispossess him shows the length which men might go to compass their ends : and when such things were done by the king, the fountain of justice, the powerful upper classes would not be restrained by ordinary scruples. The laws in Israel were customs rather than statutes, based on equity more than enactment. And when society lost the sense of justice and brotherhood the "law was slacked, and judgment did never go forth" (Hab. i. 4). It is the air of a society in this condition that Amos feels he is breathing; both in religion and in things civil it is the spirit of the people that he reprobates.

Whatever genuine religion there may have been in Israel, the national worship probably contained too fundamental a falsehood to retain influence over the people as a whole. The salt eventually lost its savour, society became secularized in its spirit, there was an overmastering devotion to trade, and fraudulence in the prosecution of it: "When will the new moon be over, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat? making the ephah small, and the shekel great; . . . that we may buy the poor for silver, and sell the refuse of the wheat?" (viii. 5, 6.) Even in a more decided way the spirit of ungodliness revealed itself in revelry and illegality at the religious shrines: "That drink wine out of sacrificial bowls, and lay themselves on pledged garments beside every altar, and drink the wine of the condemned in the house of their God" (ii. 8). But they went further: they were not only wicked, they became calculating in their wickedness; they went about beforehand to remove obstacles to it: "Ye made the Nazarites drink wine; and the prophets ye commanded, saying, Prophecy not" (ii. 12). They stopped the mouths of the prophets, not being able to corrupt them, and the Nazarites they seduced, that they might silence the reproof of their temperance and self-restraint. Greed of gain, luxury, oppression of one another; such irreverence, that it sinned

even in the holy place ; such impenitent hardihood, that it strove to befool and silence the voice of God among them—these were the sins of the time. And this stern shepherd from the south was the man chosen of God to denounce them and foreshow His certain judgments upon them. No fitter instrument could have been found ; the disease needed a desperate remedy, if any remedy now availed ; these corrupt members must be hewed by the prophets, if any part of the body was to be saved. And to the soft livers in the northern capital the wild, tragic shepherd from the wilderness must have been as wonderful and disquieting as they were odious to him. In the language of Amaziah, the land was not able to bear all his words.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

### A PROBLEM IN CRITICISM.

PAPIAS records that he took no pleasure in “those who related the commandments of others, but in those who reported the commandments given by the Lord to the faithful and derived from the truth itself” (*οὐ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς παραγενομένας τῆς ἀληθείας*). In this Papias, despite the traditional smallness of his intelligence, exhibited a soundness of judgment, which the theology of the future will do well to imitate, for, although the loftiest science and the most advanced thought must always acknowledge the real existence of the unseen and spiritual by the side of the seen and material, of that which is the object of faith by the side of that which is the object of reason, still it is certain that, where statements concerning the spiritual world are made on evidence which can be investigated by reason, that



evidence will be keenly scrutinised, and its exact value must therefore be carefully considered by those who ground their statements upon it. Now assuredly the only indisputably certain authority for the Christian religion must be looked for in the records of the words and works of Christ Himself. From this point of view therefore an inquiry into the history and origin of the Gospels becomes of primary interest, and, without entering on disputable questions, it may at any rate be fairly assumed that an examination into the origin of the Synoptic Gospels is the first problem with which criticism has to deal.

The problem, it is well known, is immensely complex ; but its immense importance is equally clear. In England, however, it has apparently never excited more than a languid interest, and, where it has not been dismissed with an easy sneer at the discordant views which have been arrived at by foreign students, it has been considered sufficient to explain the startling similarities and the startling divergences of the three Gospels by referring to an "oral tradition," which at the time of their composition was partly already crystallized into a definite shape and partly still fluid and amorphous, and by pointing out that the similarities are chiefly found in the reported *sayings* of Christ, which would naturally be preserved with special care, whereas the divergences chiefly occur in the *narrative* portions, where variation in the tradition would more naturally exist.

Thus stated generally this explanation is extremely plausible : when tested however by reference to particular passages, it appears less satisfactory. One such passage I propose to examine, which, if my views are correct, cannot be explained on the hypothesis of a purely oral tradition. The problem thus limited admits of much easier examination, without however losing any of its interest : if, in a single instance, it can be shown that a common *written*

document underlies the text of the three Evangelists, then amid the quicksands of controversy we obtain at any rate one solid point of rock as a foundation for future work of enduring stability. That the view which I take of the passage, which I propose to consider, is certainly right, I do not assert; but I unhesitatingly hold that the point raised is of crucial importance and therefore deserving of the attention of scholars.

The passage itself is this, the text used being that of Westcott and Hort :

"Οταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὕπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη.—Mark xiii. 14.

"Οταν οὖν ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη.—Matt. xxiv. 15, 16.

"Οταν δὲ ἴδῃτε κυκλομένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἱερουσαλήμ, τότε γινώτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη.—Luke xxi. 20, 21.

It is plain here that, whatever were the *ipsissima verba* of Christ, it is the same utterance which is being reproduced by the three Evangelists, for, apart from the unity of the context in which the passage occurs, the opening words, ὅταν ἴδῃτε, and the concluding words, τότε . . . ὄρη, are identical in all three. Further, it is plain with regard to this utterance, of which we have thus a triple record, that the central portion exhibits very great similarity in Mark and Matthew and very great divergence in Luke.

Now, in examining this triple record, the principle so commonly used in criticism, that whatever is hard to explain is more likely to be original than what is easy, may undoubtedly be applied; and the words of Mark and Matthew may be accepted as more original than those of Luke, for it is impossible to understand how the very clear and simple language of Luke could, if original, have been altered into

the extremely obscure language of Mark and Matthew. The central portion therefore of Luke may be considered as an explanatory paraphrase, given by him of certain words in the original authority employed by him, which he knew would be unintelligible to his readers. That he did however possess the original tradition in the same form with Mark and Matthew is fairly deducible from his use of the word *ἐρημώσεως*, and perhaps from his curious use of *γνώτε* compared with *ὁ ἀναγιώσκων νοεῖτω*.<sup>1</sup>

The problem is thus narrowed to a consideration of the central portion as presented by Mark and Matthew. The words which have to be examined are these :

Τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγιώσκων νοεῖτω (MARK).

Τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγιώσκων νοεῖτω (MATTHEW).

Now in these words, the first point which strikes the mind is the great strangeness and difficulty of the phrase τὸ βδ. . . . δεῖ in Mark. Bearing in mind the great accuracy (*ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, Papias*) which Mark exhibits throughout his Gospel, and the law of preferring the more difficult, there is certainly a *prima facie* case for supposing that Mark here more closely represents the original authority, and this view is remarkably strengthened by the peculiar character of the additional words, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, found in Matthew; for the definite reference to prophecy is especially characteristic of Matthew, and the particular form of expression, διὰ Δ. τοῦ προφήτου is only found in his of the three Gospels. It seems reasonable therefore to infer that the words τὸ ῥηθὲν

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted in passing, that we have here a very valuable indication of Luke's method of dealing with his materials; and that, although his explanation is clearly *ex post facto*, and must have been written after the siege of Jerusalem, yet this very fact also clearly suggests the inference that the text of Mark and Matthew is antecedent to that event—an inference of the highest value.

διὰ Δ. τοῦ προφ. are an addition made by Matthew to the original, and that in conformity with them he has preferred, instead of the obscure ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, to write ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ; for the passage or passages in Daniel (ix. 27, xii. 11), to which he distinctly refers his readers, though extremely ambiguous in other respects, do at any rate connect "the abomination of desolation" with sacrifice and offerings, and so with a "holy place," probably the Temple.

Let us proceed then on the supposition that Mark here most closely represents the original tradition. And, although we call this a supposition, let it be remembered that it approximates very closely to a certainty; for the language of the three writers, partly divergent and partly identical, does present a problem of which some solution must exist; and in seeking for that solution it is absolutely necessary to regard the words of one of the three as more closely representing the words actually spoken than those of the other two. The choice must be made, and, whereas the argument which gives the preference to Mark only involves assumptions which are reasonable and in accordance with the ordinary laws of criticism, on the other hand, any argument used to support the greater closeness to the original of either Matthew or Luke is at once confronted with the insoluble problem of accounting for the development of Mark's striking and difficult words from an original so comparatively simple as the words of Matthew, or so absolutely simple as those of Luke.

Now in the passage as given in Mark, after the obscurity of the words τὸ βδ. . . . δεῖ, the second point which strikes the attention is the very remarkable and unique parenthesis, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, and it is this parenthesis which we are now at last fairly in a position to consider. In the first place, it is certain that ἀναγινώσκω means "to read," "to peruse a written document" (cf. Eph. iii. 4, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώ-

σκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου; Acts viii. 30, Ἀρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις), and that the parenthesis is an instruction or warning to the person reading the words which precede to endeavour to form a definite mental conception of their meaning. It is clear, in the second place, that in Mark, if these words are assumed to form part of our Lord's utterance, there is no mention whatever of any written document to which they can naturally refer. In Matthew it might perhaps be urged that the reference to Daniel makes the use of ἀναγινώσκων by Christ Himself just possible, though even there such an appeal to the *reader* of what was *spoken* by Daniel would be very strange, and the introduction of such a remarkable parenthesis into our Lord's words is extremely harsh and unnatural (see Weiss in Meyer's *Kommentar*, *ad loc.*). In Mark however it seems quite impossible to believe that our Lord, after using the words "abomination of desolation," should, without in any way referring to them as forming part of a written document or "scripture," insert a parenthesis urging any one who *read* them to endeavour to understand them. Such an appeal to "readers" is moreover quite opposed to the continual and invariable appeal to "hearers" in our Lord's discourses; and further, the appeal, if made by Christ, is made in a form the direct reverse of what would naturally be expected: appeals, injunctions, warnings, are usually directly personal in form, yet in this case we must assume that Christ turns aside from the four disciples, whom He is addressing privately (κατ' ἰδίαν), and whom He addresses throughout as "you," and suddenly inserts words of general warning addressed to "any one that readeth."<sup>1</sup> Such a supposition is inconceivable.

We are now left face to face with these words as forming a parenthesis inserted by some one into our Lord's words,

<sup>1</sup> The use of the article is well known, cf. ὁ βουλούμενος, ὁ ἐπιών, etc.



and found so inserted in exactly the same place in both Mark and Matthew. Of this phenomenon there are only five possible explanations: (1) that each writer inserted the parenthesis independently, *proprio motu*; (2) that the words are a gloss; (3) that Mark borrowed from Matthew; (4) that Matthew borrowed from Mark; (5) that Mark and Matthew both employed a common document. The first is the view of Bengel; but, if correct, the coincidence is so astounding as probably to be unique in literature. The second is suggested by Alford, but rests on no shadow of evidence. The third may be dismissed unhesitatingly, and the fourth with almost equal confidence, for reasons which are well known and may be found in Alford's Introduction to his *Commentary on the Gospels*. The fifth solution is one which presents no reasonable difficulty, and would, in dealing with any other than biblical writings, be, I believe, at once accepted.

It is well known that the early Christians attached, and rightly attached, a pre-eminent importance to the utterances of our Lord (λογία κυριακά); and it is, to say the least, highly probable that these utterances were at a very early period committed to writing. It is at any rate certain that, when Luke's Gospel was written, there already existed many "narratives" (διηγήσεις) "drawn up in order," which recorded the words and works of our Lord, which Luke regards as similar in character to his own Gospel (ἔδοξε καὶ ἐμοί), and which can hardly have been other than written. There being therefore no antecedent improbability, but rather considerable probability, in the very early existence of written documents embodying, to various extents and doubtless in somewhat diverging forms, the oral tradition of our Lord's discourses, what right or reason have we to look with suspicion on the evidence which the text of the three Evangelists here affords of the existence of a document containing the present passage, and which was

employed by them all in writing their Gospels? Surely, on the contrary, to be brought face to face with a document which existed before any of the Gospels is something of surpassing interest and importance. Every step which brings us closer to the central figure of Christianity is an immense gain. It cannot be ours to hear the living voice of Him who "spake as never man spake"; but, amid much that is perplexing and obscure, there is, if we will but see it with our eyes, much that—like the present passage—we may rightly and reasonably accept as presenting us with a record of the actual words of Christ, as they were accepted and recorded by His followers at a time when those followers were still taught by His own immediate disciples, and when therefore the accepted tradition may fairly be considered accurate and authentic.

THOMAS ETHELBERT PAGE.

### THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

#### V.

"For perhaps he was therefore parted from thee for a season, that thou shouldest have him for ever; no longer as a servant, but more than a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much rather to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord. If then thou countest me a partner, receive him as myself. But if he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account; I Paul write it with mine own hand, I will repay it: that I say not unto thee how that thou owest to me even thine own self besides."—PHILEM. 15-19 (Rev. Ver.).

THE first words of these verses are connected with the preceding by the "for" at the beginning; that is to say, the thought that possibly the Divine purpose in permitting the flight of Onesimus was his restoration, in eternal and holy relationship, to Philemon was Paul's reason for not carrying out his wish to keep Onesimus as his own attendant and helper. "I did not decide, though I very much

wished, to retain him without your consent, because it is possible that he was allowed to flee from you, though his flight was his own blameable act, in order that he might be given back to you, a richer possession, a brother instead of a slave."

I. There is here a Divine purpose discerned as shining through a questionable human act.

The first point to note is, with what charitable delicacy of feeling the Apostle uses a mild word to express the fugitive's flight. He will not employ the harsh naked word "ran away." It might irritate Philemon. Besides, Onesimus has repented of his faults, as is plain from the fact of his voluntary return, and therefore there is no need for dwelling on them. The harshest, sharpest words are best when callous consciences are to be made to wince; but words that are balm and healing are to be used when men are heartily ashamed of their sins. So the deed for which Philemon's forgiveness is asked is half veiled in the phrase "he was parted."

Not only so, but the word suggests that behind the slave's mutiny and flight there was another Will working, of which, in some sense, Onesimus was but the instrument. He "*was parted*"—not that he was not responsible for his flight, but that, through his act, which in the eyes of all concerned was wrong, Paul discerns as dimly visible a great Divine purpose.

But he puts that as only a possibility: "*Perhaps* he departed from thee."—He will not be too sure of what God means by such and such a thing, as some of us are wont to be, as if we had been sworn of God's privy council. "*Perhaps*" is one of the hardest words for minds of a certain class to say; but in regard to all such subjects, and to many more, it is the motto of the wise man, and the shibboleth which sifts out the patient, modest lovers of truth from rash theorists and precipitate dogmatisers. Impatience of un-

certainty is a moral fault which mars many an intellectual process ; and its evil effects are nowhere more visible than in the field of theology. A humble "perhaps" often grows into a "verily, verily,"—and a hasty, over-confident "verily, verily" often dwindles to a hesitating "perhaps." Let us not be in too great a hurry to make sure that we have the key of the cabinet where God keeps His purposes, but content ourselves with "perhaps" when we are interpreting the often questionable ways of His providences, each of which has many meanings and many ends.

But however modestly he may hesitate as to the application of the principle, Paul has no doubt as to the principle itself ; namely, that God, in the sweep of His wise providence, utilizes even men's evil, and works it in, to the accomplishment of great purposes far beyond their ken, as nature, in her patient chemistry, takes the rubbish and filth of the dunghill and turns them into beauty and food. Onesimus had no high motives in his flight ; he had run away under discreditable circumstances, and perhaps to escape deserved punishment. Laziness and theft had been the hopeful companions of his flight, which, so far as he was concerned, had been the outcome of low and probably criminal impulses ; and yet God had known how to use it so as to lead to his becoming a Christian. "With the wrath of man Thou girdest Thyself," twisting and bending it so as to be flexible in Thy hands, and "the remainder Thou dost restrain." How unlike were the seed and the fruit—the flight of a good-for-nothing thief and the return of a Christian brother ! He meant it not so ; but in running away from his master, he was going straight into the arms of his Saviour. How little Onesimus knew what was to be the end of that day's work, when he slunk out of Philemon's house with his stolen booty hid away in his bosom ! And how little any of us know where we are going, and what strange results may evolve themselves from our

actions! Blessed they who can rest in the confidence that, however modest we should be in our interpretation of the events of our own or of other men's lives, the infinitely complex web of circumstance is woven by a loving, wise Hand, and takes shape, with all its interlacing threads, according to a pattern in His hand, which will vindicate itself when it is finished!

The contrast is emphatic between the short absence and the eternity of the new relationship: "for a season"—literally an hour—and "for ever." There is but one point of view which gives importance to this material world, with all its fleeting joys and fallacious possessions. Life is not worth living, unless it be the vestibule to a life beyond. Why all its discipline, whether of sorrow or joy, unless there be another, ampler life, where we can use to nobler ends the powers acquired and greatened by use here? What an inconsequent piece of work is man, if the few years of earth are his all! Surely, if nothing is to come of all this life here, men are made in vain, and had better not have been at all. Here is a narrow sound, with a mere ribbon of sea in it, shut in between grim, echoing rocks. How small and meaningless it looks as long as the fog lies on and hides the great ocean beyond! But when the mist lifts, and we see that the narrow strait leads out into a boundless sea that lies flashing in the sunshine to the horizon, then we find out the worth of that little dribble of water at our feet. It connects with the open sea, and that swathes the world. So is it with "the hour" of life; it opens out and debouches into the "for ever," and therefore it is great and solemn. This moment is one of the moments of that hour. We are the sport of our own generalizations, and ready to admit all these fine and solemn things about life, but we are less willing to apply them to the single moments as they fly. We should not rest content with recognising the general truth, but ever make conscious effort to feel that



*this* passing instant has something to do with our eternal character and with our eternal destiny.

That is an exquisitely beautiful and tender thought which the Apostle puts here, and one which is susceptible of many applications. The temporary loss may be eternal gain. The dropping away of the earthly form of a relationship may, in God's great mercy, be a step towards its renewal in higher fashion and for evermore. All our blessings need to be past before reflection can be brought to bear upon them, to make us conscious how blessed we were. The blossoms have to perish before the rich perfume, which can be kept in undiminished fragrance for years, can be distilled from them. When death takes away dear ones, we first learn that we were entertaining angels unawares; and as they float away from us into the light, they look back with faces already beginning to brighten into the likeness of Christ, and take leave of us with His valediction, "It is expedient for you that I go away." Memory teaches us the true character of life. We can best estimate the height of the mountain peaks when we have left them behind. The softening and hallowing influence of death reveals the nobleness and sweetness of those who are gone. Fair country never looks so fair as when it has a curving river for a foreground, and their lines look fairer than before, when seen across the Jordan of death.

To us who believe that life and love are not killed by death, the end of their earthly form is but the beginning of a higher heavenly. Love which is "in Christ" is eternal. Because Philemon and Onesimus were two Christians, therefore their relationship was eternal. Is it not yet more true, if that were possible, that the sweet bonds which unite Christian souls here on earth are in their essence indestructible, and are affected by death only as the body is? Sown in weakness, will they not be raised in power? Nothing of them shall die but the encompassing death.

Their mortal part shall put on immortality. As the farmer gathers the green flax with its blue bells blooming on it, and throws it into a tank to rot, in order to get the firm fibre which cannot rot, and spin it into a strong cable, so God does with our earthly loves. He causes all about them that is perishable to perish, that the central fibre, which is eternal, may stand clear and disengaged from all that was less Divine than itself. Wherefore mourning hearts may stay themselves on this assurance, that they will never lose the dear ones whom they have loved in Christ, and that death itself but changes the manner of the communion, and refines the tie. They were as for a moment dead, but they are alive again. To our bewildered sight they departed and were lost for a season, but they are found, and we can fold them in our heart of hearts for ever.

But there is also set forth here a change, not only in the duration but in the quality of the relation between the Christian master and his former slave, who continues a slave indeed, but is also a brother. "No longer as a servant, but more than a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much rather to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord." It is clear from these words that Paul did not anticipate the manumission of Onesimus. What he asks is, that he should not be received *as* a slave. Evidently then he is to be still a slave in so far as the outward fact goes—but a new spirit is to be breathed into the relationship. "Specially to me"; he is more than a slave to me. I have not looked on him as such, but have taken him to my heart as a brother, as a son indeed, for he is especially dear to me as my convert. But however dear he is to me, he should be more so thee, to whom his relation is permanent, while to me it is temporary. And this brotherhood of the slave is to be felt and made visible "both in the flesh"—that is, in the earthly and personal relations of common life, "and in the Lord"—that is, in the

spiritual and religious relationships of worship and the Church.

As has been well said, "In the flesh, Philemon has the brother for his slave; in the Lord, Philemon has the slave for his brother." He is to treat him as his brother therefore both in the common relationships of every-day life and in the acts of religious worship.

That is a pregnant word. True, there is no gulf between Christian people now-a-days like that which in the old times parted owner and slave; but, as society becomes more and more differentiated, as the diversities of wealth become more extreme in our commercial communities, as education comes to make the educated man's whole way of looking at life differ more and more from that of the less cultured classes, the injunction implied in our text encounters enemies quite as formidable as slavery ever was. The highly educated man is apt to be very oblivious of the brotherhood of the ignorant Christian, and he, on his part, finds the recognition just as hard. The rich mill-owner has not much sympathy with the poor brother who works at his spinning jennies. It is often difficult for the Christian mistress to remember that her cook is her sister in Christ. There is quite as much sin against fraternity on the side of the poor Christians who are servants and illiterate, as on the side of the rich who are masters or cultured. But the principle that Christian brotherhood is to reach across the wall of class distinctions is as binding to-day as it was on these two good people, Philemon the master and Onesimus the slave.

That brotherhood is not to be confined to acts and times of Christian communion, but is to be shown and to shape conduct in common life. "Both in the flesh and in the Lord" may be put into plain English thus—a rich man and a poor one belong to the same Church; they unite in the same worship, they are "partakers of the

one bread," and therefore, Paul thinks, "are one bread." They go outside the church door. Do they ever dream of speaking to one another outside? "A brother beloved in the Lord,"—on Sundays, and during worship and in Church matters,—is often a stranger "in the flesh" on Mondays, in the street, and in common life. Some good people seem to keep their brotherly love in the same wardrobe with their Sunday clothes. Philemon was bid, and all are bid, to wear it all the week, at market as well as church.

II. In the next verse, the essential purpose for which the whole letter was written is put at last in an articulate request, based upon a very tender motive. "If then thou countest me as a partner, receive him as myself." Paul now at last completes the sentence which he began in *v.* 12, and from which he was hurried away by the other thoughts that came crowding in upon him. This plea for the kindly welcome to be accorded to Onesimus has been knocking at the door of his lips for utterance from the beginning of the letter; but only now, so near the end, after so much conciliation, he ventures to put it into plain words; and even now he does not dwell on it, but goes quickly on to another point. He puts his requests on a modest and yet a strong ground, appealing to Philemon's sense of comradeship—"if thou countest me a partner"—a comrade or a sharer in Christian blessings. He sinks all reference to apostolic authority, and only points to their common possession of faith, hope, and joy in Christ. "Receive him as myself." That request was sufficiently illustrated in the preceding paper, so that I need only refer to what was then said on this instance of interceding love identifying itself with its object, and on the enunciation in it of great Christian truth.

III. The course of thought next shows—Love taking the slave's debts on itself.

“If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee aught.” Paul makes an “if” of what he knew well enough to be the fact; for no doubt Onesimus had told him all his faults, and the whole context shows that there was no uncertainty in Paul’s mind, but that he puts it hypothetically for the same reason for which he chooses to say, “was parted,” instead of “ran away,” namely, to keep some thin veil over the crimes of a penitent, and not to rasp him with rough words. For the same reason he falls back upon the gentler expressions, “wronged” and “oweth,” instead of blurting out the ugly word “stolen.” And then, with a half-playful assumption of lawyer-like phraseology, he bids Philemon put that to his account. Here is my autograph—“I Paul write it with mine own hand”—I make this letter into a bond. Witness my hand; “I will repay it.” The formal tone of the promise, rendered more formal by the insertion of the name—and perhaps by that sentence only being in his own handwriting—seems to warrant the explanation that it is half playful; for he could never have supposed that Philemon would exact the fulfilment of the bond, and we have no reason to suppose that, if he had, Paul could really have paid the amount. But beneath the playfulness there lies the implied exhortation to forgive the money wrong as well as the others which Onesimus had done him.

The verb used here for *put to the account of* is, according to the commentators, a very rare word; and perhaps the singular phrase may be chosen to let another great Christian truth shine through. Was Paul’s love the only one that we know of which took the slave’s debts on itself? Did anybody else ever say, “Put that on mine account”? We have been taught to ask for the forgiveness of our sins as “debts,” and we have been taught that there is One on whom God has made to meet the iniquities of us all. Christ takes on Himself all Paul’s debt, all Philemon’s, all



ours. He has paid the ransom for all, and He so identifies Himself with men that He takes all their sins upon Him, and so identifies men with Himself that they are "received as Himself." It is His great example that Paul is trying to copy here. Forgiven all that great debt, he dare not rise from his knees to take his brother by the throat, but goes forth to show to his fellow the mercy he has found, and to model his life after the pattern of that miracle of love in which is his trust. It is Christ's own voice which echoes in "put that on mine account."

IV. Finally, these verses pass to a gentle reminder of a greater debt: "That I say not unto thee how that thou owest to me even thine own self besides."

As his child in the Gospel, Philemon owed to Paul much more than the trifle of money of which Onesimus had robbed him; namely, his spiritual life, which he had received through the Apostle's ministry. But he will not insist on that. True love never presses its claims, nor recounts its services. Claims which need to be urged are not worth urging. A true, generous heart will never say, "You ought to do so much for me, because I have done so much for you." To come down to that low level of chaffering and barter is a dreadful descent from the heights where the love which delights in giving should ever dwell.

Does not Christ speak to us in the same language? We owe ourselves to Him, as Lazarus did, for He raises us from the death of sin to a share in His own new, undying life. As a sick man owes his life to the doctor who has cured him, as a drowning man owes his to his rescuer, who dragged him from the water and breathed into his lungs till they began to work of themselves, as a child owes its life to its parent, so we owe ourselves to Christ. But He does not insist upon the debt; He gently reminds us of it, as making His commandment sweeter and easier to obey. Every heart that is really touched with gratitude will feel,

that the less the giver insists upon his gifts, the more do they impel to affectionate service. To be perpetually reminded of them weakens their force as motives to obedience, for it then appears as if they had not been gifts of love at all, but bribes given by self-interest; and the frequent reference to them sounds like complaint. But Christ does not insist on His claims, and therefore the remembrance of them ought to underlie all our lives and to lead to constant glad devotion.

One more thought may be drawn from the words. The great debt which can never be discharged does not prevent the debtor from receiving reward for the obedience of love. "I will repay it," even though thou owest me thyself. Christ has bought us for His servants by giving Himself and ourselves to us. No work, no devotion, no love can ever repay our debt to Him. From His love alone comes the desire to serve Him; from His grace comes the power. The best works are stained and incomplete, and could only be acceptable to a love that was glad to welcome even unworthy offerings, and to forgive their imperfections. Nevertheless He treats them as worthy of reward, and crowns His own grace in men with an exuberance of recompense far beyond their deserts. He will suffer no man to work for Him for nothing; but to each He gives even here "great reward *in* keeping His commandments," and hereafter "an exceeding great reward," of which the inward joys and outward blessings that now flow from obedience are but the earnest. His merciful allowance of imperfections treats even our poor deeds as rewardable; and though eternal life must ever be the *gift* of God, and no claim of merit can be sustained before His judgment seat, yet the measure of that life which is possessed here or hereafter is accurately proportioned to and is, in a very real sense, the consequence of obedience and service. "If any man's work abide, he shall receive a reward," and

Christ's own tender voice speaks the promise, "I will repay, albeit I say not unto thee how thou owest to Me even thine own self besides."

Men do not really possess themselves unless they yield themselves to Jesus Christ. He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth himself, in glad surrender of himself to his Saviour, he and only he is truly lord and owner of his own soul. And to such an one shall be given rewards beyond hope and beyond measure—and, as the crown of all, the blessed possession of Christ, and in it the full, true, eternal possession of himself, glorified and changed into the image of the Lord who loved him and gave Himself for him.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

---

### ASKING IN CHRIST'S NAME.

It is sometimes instructive to make an effort of the imagination, and ask how certain words, so familiar to us that we pass them lightly by, must, in their novel grandeur, strike upon unaccustomed ears. Let us suppose the case of a heathen who has learned the story of Jesus and become a convert. He has been taught that the universal Father listens, considerately and lovingly, to the prayers of His weakest child, so that if any trustful supplication remains ungranted, it must have been asked amiss. And now the Gospel of St. John is put into his hands, and there he finds a new promise, and words unheard before, "*Whatsoever* ye shall ask in My name, that will I do"; "If ye shall ask *anything* in My name, I will do it."

Would our convert be content, or ought he to be content; to regard these words as a mere repetition of previous

promises, such as, "Ask, and ye shall receive"? Would not the manner in which Christ announces a new privilege,— "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in My Name," convince him that some new and mighty endowment is being conferred on him, some vast addition to his spiritual powers? Surely he must be deeply impressed by the unlimited phrases, "Whatsoever ye shall ask," "If ye shall ask anything," and by the equally unqualified pledges, "That will I do," "I will do it." These cannot but speak to him of a kind of omnipotence conferred upon the Church of Christ. !

And now he tries the experiment. He asks for something large—something religious too, because it is not in a selfish or worldly mood that such thoughts are most impressive.

With trembling but genuine faith he prays for the immediate conversion of all his tribe; for the stopping of persecution; perhaps for the instant subjection of the whole world to Christ. And he is very careful to add the talismanic words, "This I ask in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord." Rising from his knees, it occurs to him to wonder that so astonishing, so all-conquering a force has been left to him (as it appears) first to set in motion. To-morrow he will be very painfully impressed and startled, for he will find the world going on as it did yesterday, the fires of persecution blazing still, and his fellow countrymen still prostrate before their hideous idols. We know how he will feel, because we too have felt exactly the same ardour followed by the same chill; we too have marvelled that so great a promise should lead to such small results.

If now the convert goes to his missionary and tells him of his failure, what will happen? Most likely he will be informed that such promises are conditional, the issue depending on the nature of what we ask. But all the nerve and energy of the passage are drawn from those two bold and absolute words, Anything and Whatsoever. Explain

them away, and you cut its very sinews and leave it powerless to add anything to promises given already.

Or he may be told that his prayer failed because it would be worse for himself that it should succeed. God was too kind to grant it. Yet he asked only for the glory of God and the well-being of souls. Or again he may be reminded that all things are subject to the wiser but inscrutable will of God. Whereas the very essence of the promise is that this Divine will, to which all things are obedient, will move parallel with his prayer.

Who has not felt, painfully and perilously, how crude and poor such explanations really are, when applied to this particular passage? Who has not reflected that leave to offer the tentative and submissive prayers of docile children to a wise and loving Father was not now in question? That boon was granted in the Sermon on the Mount, with a promise that the Father would reward His secret petitioner openly.

But here is some distinctly new promise, some fresh grace, some unprecedented endowment. Hitherto they had asked nothing in Christ's Name: now they were to ask and receive. In vain would we file down such a promise until it contains no more than the disciples enjoyed already! It actually says what our young convert would assuredly feel outraged if we told him that it does not say: it asserts that anything, great or small, which we ask of God, shall certainly be done, upon this condition and no other, that we can ask it really and indeed in the Name of Christ, and that we do so.

If only we fulfil this condition, Omnipotence itself is pledged to move with the prayer of its feeble creature. So long as we are truly subject to this one restraint, no other curb or trammel exists to restrain the perfect liberty of our successful prayers. "If ye ask anything in My Name, I will do it." If then we honestly believe Christ's word, it



follows that the very order of the world and the sovereignty of Christ are really dependent on these three words, since He would have subjected Himself to our caprices, had He pledged Himself to grant our prayers without adding the simple words "in My Name."

And therefore it is a vast condition. Nothing which satisfies it can be unwise, presumptuous, self-seeking, dishonouring to God, no such thing can be so one-sided, or hasty, or impetuous, that to grant it would be evil. For it was not rashly or unworthily that Christ hung upon this condition the perfect success of His people's most ardent prayers. And thus we see how great a delusion was this of our young convert, in being quite sure that he asked in Christ's name, because his desire was for a good thing, and he joined the name of Jesus with his prayer.

And yet we are all apt to fall into the same error, if we pray at all. When any want oppresses, or spiritual desire burns in us, and we pray earnestly and trustfully, we perceive but little difference between saying, at the close, This we ask for Christ's sake, and saying, We ask this in the name of Jesus. We confidently assume that we have satisfied this great condition; and if we do not obtain our request, perhaps we resolve not again to be so highflown, so enthusiastic: our worldly wisdom gains, no doubt; but our faith is crippled.

Yet common sense might teach us that we do not act in the name of another by either saying or believing that we do so, but only in so far as we really stand in his place, bear his commission, and represent him.

We should be more surprised than gratified if, without our expressed or implied authorization, even a familiar friend should announce that he was acting in our name. The resources of the Rothschilds would not last long, if every trader could do business in their name by simply announcing that he did so. And we should soon have to

fight the world, if every aggrieved or angry Briton in foreign parts could declare war in the name of England. This is only in the power of her ambassadors and ministers, and only in their power so far as their credentials reach. If they exceed these, we repudiate their action and disgrace them.

Now the Twelve had already been acting "in Christ's Name" among men. This did not mean that that they had healed diseases and cast out devils for Christ's sake, but that they did so as His envoys, His spokesmen, His ambassadors and apostles. Thus they were prepared to understand the new truth, that in the Name of Christ they might also pray.

When, as a grand addition to all former invitations and encouragements to pray, they received this special promise to their prayers of a special kind, that these, like charity, should never fail, the phrase was familiar, and it did not speak to them of any expression of their own human longings, making known their requests to God. These also were lawful, and had vast endowments, but this was a new thing and more sublime. It was the identification of the servant with his Lord, not only as heretofore in works of mercy, but now also in communion with God.

The name of Jesus was no mere spell by which a wizard might enforce his wishes, as their rabbis deemed that Solomon, by some secret name of God, compelled all the spirits to obey his will. The seven sons of Scæva learned the difference when they employed it as an incantation against an evil spirit, only to meet the fierce rejoinder, "Who are ye?" That was the question. Jesus he knew, and the connexion between Him and Paul. But these obtained no power by the use of the sacred formula; for who were they themselves?

Again, when St. Peter said to the impotent man, "In the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk," he

certainly did not mean to adjure him for Christ's sake. No; the words declared that he spoke not on his own behalf, but as invested with the authority of a deputy and ambassador, and in his Master's stead. And a careful study of what this implies will perhaps enable us to receive in their obvious sense the words of St. Paul, "If I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ," rising above all individuality of resentment or of placability, and conscious that I speak in the fulness of the spirit of the Lord of Pardons.

In this sense the Apostles had asked nothing in Christ's Name until now, when a mighty change was coming over their mutual relations, when He was calling them no more servants but friends, when He was showing them all things that Himself did. Now they are taught that this highest attainment of humanity might hold good in prayer to God as well as in the evangelization of the world. And this was new.

Doubtless they had often been encouraged in their prayers, by reflecting that they were dear to Him who was so dear to God: consciously or unconsciously they had prayed "for the sake of Jesus." But He takes care to show that He is now busy with some other thought than that of His intercession for them, by the words, "I say not that I will pray the Father for you." This also was true, but it was not the matter in hand: not His condescension to man, but man's elevation towards Him and in Him. His people are to act for Him on earth, and in such action He will Himself dwell with them and be in them. And as far as their prayers are genuine expressions of that mysterious but most real oneness with their Lord, how can they be rejected?

As far as any looks out upon the world with Christ's eyes, feels with Christ's heart, yearns and strives with Christ's deep and unselfish and patient desires, so far will

that man be recognised as Christ's representative, and be entitled, because he will be qualified, to speak in Christ's Name. He will not cease to be an individual, a man whose flesh and blood find natural and blameless utterance, and who beseeches the Lord thrice that his "thorn" may be taken away. Nor shall such a prayer be lightly rejected. Rejected nevertheless it will surely be, if the strength of Christ may thereby rest upon the sufferer, if the refusal of what is asked, and asked doubtless for Christ's sake, may qualify him, uplifted, chastened, and released from self, to ask other gifts more truly in Christ's Name.

Thus we come to distinguish the prayers here spoken of, not only from those which are soiled by weakness, love of the world or love of ease, but from all those prayers (lawful and indeed imperatively required of us, but yet individual and local) which tell of our private sorrows, and make our own requests known to God, as the way to escape from our anxieties.

Our haste for immediate results, our desire that the good seed should bear much fruit without falling into the ground and dying, our spiritual egoism,—these cannot speak with this victorious and royal voice.

And yet, since there is a union between Christ and His people, real as between the human body and the bread which feeds it, enduring and tender as between the Bridegroom and the bride, intimate and organic as between the Head and its members, therefore there are prayers in which speaks neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; prayers in which Christ is all, and in all who utter them; prayers that share His patience who has sat down expecting till His enemies be made His footstool, His lowliness, who is still, in the midst of the throne, a Lamb; prayers which arise above self, above the fall and the infirmities of our nature, and above its haste; prayers which share with Him the burden of the world, its sins, its

sorrows, and its heathenisms; prayers which are the utterance of our awful and royal priesthood unto God, not as ordained ministers, but as Christian souls; prayers which know that they ask according to His will, and therefore that He heareth them, and therefore that they have the petitions which they desire of Him.

GEO. A. CHADWICK.

---

### *THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.*

IN the Epistles of St. Ignatius we have a perfectly clear picture of the organization of the Churches of Asia in the first quarter of the second century; every city has its bishop, who is surrounded by a spiritual crown of presbyters, and they have deacons to minister to them. Apparently any believer, at least with the sanction of the bishop, is still competent to celebrate the Eucharist; but the hierarchy, though it has not yet finally reserved the exclusive function of acting in the name of the community, is already completely organized on the lines that are to persist for centuries. After the investigations of the Bishop of Durham, it cannot be doubted that the letters which have come down to us in the name of the saint are, to say the least, full of his phrases and full of his spirit; so the picture is trustworthy as well as clear.

When we turn to St. Clement's letter to the Corinthians everything seems obscure; the one point clear is, that a strong party was eager to do something which the writer regarded as a grievous wrong to the whole body of presbyters; and this wrong is to be inflicted in the interests of one or two. It seems to be commonly supposed that the Church of Corinth, if not the Church of Rome, was then under a board or college of coequal presbyters; it is no objection to this that the "presbyters" or "seniors" are



twice (cc. i., xxi.) contrasted with *ἡγούμενοι* and *προηγούμενοι*, for in both passages they are also contrasted with the young. In a model community leaders or superiors (who include no doubt any resident prophets or teachers) are obeyed, the old are honoured, the young are trained. But if there was a college of coequal presbyters, what was there to fight about? Why could not the partisans of the "one or two" be pacified by adding them to the college? If the Corinthians wanted to have a bishop like their brethren at Smyrna or Ephesus, that was no reason for getting rid of the presbyters, though they might have felt themselves slighted at having a bishop put over them. But the writer speaks as if they were not only slighted but wronged, as if the party had deprived some of them of a rank, all of them of a right.

My impression is, that every presbyter at Corinth had a vested right to succeed to the bishopric in his turn, or that at most the community had a voice as to which presbyter should succeed; and that a party had arisen which said, Here is so-and-so or so-and-so, ever so much fitter to be bishop than any of these dull old presbyters. It may also be conjectured that, as the community in general was divided into "seniors" and "juniors," the dispute was the bitterer because the insubordinate party put forward a candidate from the ranks of the latter. Here are my reasons,—which do not strike me as decisive, nor does this trouble me, for there is no reason to measure the importance of questions by their difficulty; our duty to-day cannot vary as we know a little more or a little less of times of which we shall never know all or much,—such as they are, they are these: In the first place, St. Clement clearly admits that the presbyters were outshone by their rival or rivals. All that he has to say of the presbyters is, that they "offered the gifts holily and unblamably" (c. xliv.); on the other hand, we read (c. xlvi.) of the

rival or rivals, "let one be faithful, let him be mighty to declare knowledge, let him be wise in declaring of questions, let him be pure in his doings, for the more he seemeth to be great above others the more he is debtor to bear a humble mind." So again (c. liv.), "Who among you is generous, who is compassionate, who is fulfilled with love, let him say, 'If I am an occasion of sedition and strife and schisms, I depart.'" Obviously though the "one or two persons who occasion the schism" (c. xlvii.) are not equal to Paul, or Cephas, or Apollos, they are the ornaments of the Church of their time, and they are not necessarily more to blame for the indiscretion of their partisans than their greater predecessors. One cannot identify them with the actual authors of the schism who are rebuked in c. lvii., and bidden put away the vaunting and haughty conceit of their tongue. Next, it seems tolerably clear that the trouble arose about a contested election of some kind, and that St. Clement thought the Corinthians greatly to blame for flying in the face of the holy Apostles who had made wise arrangements to save the Church from such a trouble. Unless it is certain beforehand that presbyter and bishop are synonymous in all Christian writings older than St. Ignatius, it would seem that, whatever the relation between bishops and deacons on the one hand and presbyters on the other, St. Clement begins with bishops and deacons. He does not assume, as it is assumed in the *Didaché*, that the community appoints them by its own free action. In the beginning the Apostles, who themselves were evangelized by the Lord, appointed their firstfruits bishops and deacons of those who should believe (c. xlii.). They knew also by the Lord that strife would arise about the name of bishopric, *i.e.* the dignity of bishop; this was the reason that they appointed the first bishops and deacons themselves, this was why they made provision for a succession during the lifetime of the first incumbents. Neither the text nor the

rendering is quite certain, but this is nearly clear. If we read *ἐπινομήν*, the meaning will probably be, that the first bishops were the heirs, *κληρονόμοι*, of the Apostles; but that, in view of their death, the Apostles constituted *ἐπίνομοι*, remainder men, or granted a right of supplementary succession, that there might be other approved men to succeed to their ministry, *i.e.* that of the first bishops. If one reads *ἐπιμονήν*, the same meaning is expressed more clearly if less pregnantly: the translation will be, they provided for continuance. Any way it is quite clear that St. Clement says the Apostles were not content to appoint the first bishops; they did something more: and therefore the "other approved men" are other not than the Apostles but other than the first bishops, and it is to them that they succeed. And this system went on mechanically; "other men of high account" (? the apostles and prophets of the *Didaché*) continued to do what the Apostles in the strict sense had done; only these last seem to have felt that their action required "the consent of the whole Church," which has not been mentioned before. Whoever appoints, these persons are appointed precisely that when the bishopric is vacant there may be some one with a clear right to succeed. They are bishops expectant, and in the mean time they are colleagues and assistants to the bishop, they have a "ministry" to exercise, they "offer gifts." One can hardly doubt that as a rule they conduct the Eucharist. They form a body, the "elders" of the new Israel. It is to be noticed that they are independent of the bishop; whatever rights they have, they do not derive them from him: and yet his superiority to them requires no explanation; his authority is original and self-sufficing, they are associated with him though not by him in his dignity. St. Clement does not regard them as absolutely independent of the community. They seem in his view to hold office *ad vitam aut culpam*; and the community is the competent

judge of their faults. He asserts that they have always borne themselves "with humble-mindedness," as if even haughtiness might imaginably justify or excuse deposition. However, as there is no fault to find with them, it will be no small sin to us if we reject them from the bishopric (c. xlv.). The use of the first person in c. xxi. makes it more likely that here too the writer identifies himself with the Church of Corinth, than that he speaks judicially in the name of the Church of Rome. He goes on "Happy are the elders who finished their course before, forasmuch as their departure was fruitful and perfect; for they have no care lest any remove them from their established station. For we see that ye have removed certain of good conversation from the ministry they honoured by their innocency." It is to be remembered that it was not the aim of St. Clement to draw up a clear summary of the exact situation at Corinth, he wrote rather to edify his contemporaries than to instruct them, so that it is a good deal more hopeless to reconstruct the precise state of things from his letter than it would be to reconstruct the controversies of our own day from a stray charge of Bishop Thirlwall's some eighteen centuries hence. The one clear point is, that there was a faction at Corinth against the presbyters, and that some, not all, had been actually deposed; and even here one must be on one's guard. St. Clement is a better witness to what the Apostles and apostolic men had instituted than to the misdeeds of the Corinthians: he does not seem to have heard at first hand what the leaders of the faction had to say; he endorses discreetly the complaints of the presbyters. If we take his word that they were in the right on the whole, it does not follow that they did not exaggerate. Assuming, however, that some presbyters had been deposed, why not all? Can we guess that some of the presbyters had already served the office of bishop, and that these had no personal motive for

resisting the faction, and the faction had no motive for proceeding to extremities against them. We do not know what the functions of a bishop in the first century were; but it is pretty safe to suppose that even then he administered the "alms" and presented the "oblations." Whether one supposes him the inspector of the common fund, of the common worship, of the deacons, or of the congregation, it seems as if the office was as monarchical in its nature as the consulate. A large number of colleagues would have left the work undone to save quarrelling how it was to be done. When one reads in an inscription of one of the cities of the Hauràn, that a certain tribe took the "bishopric," as in Athens a certain tribe took the presidency, we may be sure that the bishopric involved no practical business. Nor is there anything in the nature of the office to suggest that it must always have been permanent. If a bishop had a gift like a prophet, both might exercise the gift by turns. Was the office of deacon temporary when a man who "used it well" (and laid it down?) "purchased to himself a good degree"? Can we compare *οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι*, with *οἱ καλῶς διακονήσαντες* (1 Tim. iii. 13; v. 17), and translate, elders who *have* ruled well? We find that "rulers" both in Romans xii. and Thessalonians i. are *προϊστάμενοι* in the present, which is also used of the qualification of bishops and deacons. At any rate we are told, "If any man desire a bishopric, he desires a good work." Does this imply that he will not have to wait for a death vacancy; that there would be vacancies that it was no discredit to count upon, to be openly anxious to fill? In colleges there are offices which no one desires, and everybody who is fit is expected to serve; others which are desirable, which the holder is expected to vacate and make room for others.

Now, if we suppose a number of elderly men, each with a right to succeed to an important office, there would be



a strong mixture of motives tending to establish some more or less formal scheme of rotation which would make it practically certain that everybody entitled to succeed would live to do so, and depart with the feeling that his career had been "fruitful and perfect." Of course, things might have taken another turn; the acting bishop or bishops might after one or more successions have come down to be completely on a level with the other presbyters without the change being noticed; only then, how was it that by the middle of the second century all existing Churches which had changed in this way had changed back again without that being noticed either?

Possibly the conjecture that the episcopate was once a temporary as well as a local office may derive some support from the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians. St. Irenæus mentions such an epistle, and ours may very well be the same. If so, it is more likely than not that it had been in existence a good while when St. Irenæus quotes it, even if St. Polycarp did not write it; while it is also likely that whoever wrote in St. Polycarp's name wrote after his glorious martyrdom. Most of the letter tells us no more of the situation of its real or supposed readers than an average excellent sermon tells us of the situation of its hearers. We are to understand that St. Polycarp writes on the occasion of the kindness of the Philippians to St. Ignatius and his companions, apparently with the object of moderating their indignation against Valens, once a presbyter among them, who has defrauded the Church, which still has to take final action on his frauds. Unluckily the Greek of the passage about Valens is lost. The Latin runs: "Nimis contristatus sum pro Valente, qui presbyter factus est aliquando apud vos, quod sic ignoret is locum qui datus est ei." The description of Valens is puzzling. If the Latin were the original, *aliquando* might very well mean "at last," and it would make very good sense to sup-

pose that the writer regrets that Valens should have disgraced himself when he had just realized his ambition ; but one cannot imagine a Greek original with this meaning that would suggest *aliquando* to a literal translator. If one imagines the letter written some forty to fifty years after its assumed date, some readers who knew what had passed at Philippi in St. Polycarp's time would remember Valens ; most would need to be told or reminded who he was ; few if any who knew would stumble at the form of the reminder. Can the words be simply a gloss ? Whatever we have of or about St. Polycarp (except fragments in St. Irenæus and Eusebius) seems to have passed through the hands of St. Pionius in the third century, and Pioniaster in the fourth. Valens and his wife, if they repent, will be restored as members of the Philippian Church ; so we cannot guess that after being presbyter there he had gone away, and after an interval, which would be implied in *aliquando*, found some opportunity of defrauding the brethren there. If the letter is genuine and the text right, we might almost guess that Valens after having been presbyter had been bishop, and that St. Polycarp writes on the news of his behaviour, when the time came for him to give an account of his stewardship. If this were so, there might be some difficulty about a successor. If the bishopric at Philippi was vacant or disputed, or if the bishop who had been a presbyter would on ceasing office be a presbyter again, it would be intelligible that where St. Ignatius, writing to the Magnesians, speaks of concord under the presidency of the bishop, who represents God, and the presbyters who represent the synedrion of Apostles, St. Polycarp speaks of obedience to presbyters and deacons.

Some may think it adds plausibility to this attempt to reconstruct the situation shadowed out in the documents, both of which must be very ancient, while the most ancient is almost certainly genuine, that the transition from the

situation we are imagining to the situation attested in the letters of St. Ignatius would be so very simple. We should only have to suppose two changes, both which might very well pass unnoticed, as they would naturally go together; one would be, that the episcopate became permanent, another would be, that the bishop should ordain presbyters himself, instead of leaving this to travelling "apostles" or "prophets." Both would happen, of course, when a strong man became bishop at forty and lived to be seventy.

Next we may ask if St. Clement was right in saying the Apostles established bishops and deacons everywhere. If we are right in supposing that such bishops, whether temporary or permanent, were sole administrators of their Churches, are we to suppose that the presbyters only came in by an afterthought? What again was the original unit of Church organization? How many Christians were there between the days of St. Paul and the days of St. Polycarp in Corinth, or Philippi, or Ephesus? Did they all make a point of meeting to break bread every Lord's day? Could they command anywhere the weekly use of any building or inclosure that would hold five hundred? or three? or two? No doubt the picture ap. St. Ign. *Ad Magn.*, c. vi., of the bishop with his presbyters round him and his deacons before him, and all the people orderly and obedient, is impressive; it suggests something like a public meeting in the townhall of a market town. Was such a sight to be seen every week or every month? Was it the custom to meet in the private houses of the brethren who were not quite so poor as the rest? If so, was each congregation an unit, managing its temporal affairs by its own bishop and deacons, while the spiritual affairs of the local Church were managed by the joint action of the bishops as elders? If we rate the numbers of believers high, we shall answer this question one way; if we rate it low, another. On St. Clement's theory, Stephanas (since he and his household

were the firstfruits of Achaia) would have been the first bishop of St. Paul's converts at Corinth, and some unknown person of St. Peter's, if he visited Corinth and made converts too. According to St. Jerome,—who may *perhaps* have had some other authority than the First Epistle to the Corinthians,—the rule of one bishop for each city came in to put an end to schisms, because each presbyter asserted his personal claim to the allegiance of those whom he had baptized. St. Epiphanius in one place informs us that it was the singular privilege of the Church of Alexandria, that from its foundation it had never had more than one lawful bishop at a time. If we could cross-examine him this might or might not be an important clue. Another "find" like the *Didaché* might throw light on such a text, or receive light from it. Another text of the same tantalising Father is less enigmatical. He tells us (*Hær.*, § 75) that if Aërius had fallen in with the deepest researches (? the works of Hegesippus) he would have known that in the apostolic age there were some Churches with presbyters and no bishops, others with bishops and no presbyters. St. Epiphanius, and probably his ancient authority, give a rather far-fetched reason for this: in some Churches there was no one fit to be bishop, others were too small to furnish presbyters. It would be a simpler guess that the episcopal and presbyterian organizations were originally independent. It may be significant that the Acts, which say nothing of "bishops and deacons" do say something of "elders" (though this might be an accident, if it is to be assumed that "bishops" and "elders" are convertible in the apostolic age). When Paul and Barnabas took their last journey together, we read (xiv. 23) "they ordained them elders in every Church." We are never told again of St. Paul's ordaining; he tells us himself that he hardly ever baptized. It is significant that Titus is left behind in Crete, to supply what was lacking, as if it lay outside

St. Paul's vocation to work out the material organization of the Church.

Can we guess that while St. Paul worked with St. Barnabas with the full sympathy and authority of the Church at Jerusalem, they like other Apostles established local boards of discipline, which were a sort of parallel to the local synedria aimed at by contemporary Judaism; but that after St. Paul withstood St. Peter to his face at Antioch, there was no such organization among his converts?

There was certainly none at Corinth, where he complained that "brother goeth to law with brother, and that before unbelievers." At Thessalonica there were already (1 Thess. v. 12) *προϊστάμενοι*, who hardly seem to be appointed or elected, they are commended to the grateful and deferential recognition of the community; they took more pains than others to make converts and instruct believers. Perhaps where "gifts" were less exuberant than at Corinth, they were soon recognised as leaders in worship. We learn from Romans xii. 28 that they had a special gift, and this laid on them a special obligation to "diligence"; is it fanciful to remember the qualification of the "reader" in the *διαταγαὶ* "ἐν ταῖς κυριακαῖς συνόδοις πρῶτος σύνδρομος"? Can we guess again that when the need of formal organization was felt in Churches which the original organization under elders had not reached, a new organization under bishops and deacons arose, also not without apostolic sanction, and that these originally independent schemes of organization had completely interpenetrated each other in Consular Asia in the time of St. Ignatius, and were on the way to do so in Corinth in the time of St. Clement? This guess has the incidental advantage that it explains the contrast between the position of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp. St. Ignatius is Bishop of Syria, there is no neighbouring bishop to comfort the Church of Antioch; St. Polycarp is only Bishop of Smyrna. Why? Because in Antioch, and in the cities



of Syria, the faithful had originally been organized under elders, as they were in Jerusalem ("the Lord's brother" is commonly assumed to have been the first diocesan Bishop of Jerusalem; it seems at least as likely that he presided over the elders of the true Israel as a prince of the house of David, just as, according to the Talmud, Hillel, also of the house of David, presided over the elders of Israel according to the flesh). Then St. Ignatius, and apparently St. Euhodius before him, were set over the faithful in Syria, just as St. Titus and St. Timothy were set for a time over the faithful in Crete and Asia. St. Polycarp appears in St. Ignatius' letters as a diocesan bishop. St. Ignatius himself, like St. Titus and St. Timothy, seems more like a "vicar apostolic." It is a subordinate difference, that his commission is permanent, theirs temporary. Was the commission of St. Euhodius permanent? Did St. Ignatius succeed without an interval? Exactly the constitution which existed then in Syria seems to have perpetuated itself in Egypt well into the third century. Here we have an alternative explanation of the singular fact stated by St. Epiphanius about Alexandria. St. Clement (*Strom.* vi. 14) is almost singular, especially for his age, in coupling elders and deacons. One is tempted to guess that in his idea the bishop is too distant, too exalted, to be exemplary. He does not say that the true "Gnostic" can become the true bishop, but that true Gnostics may become true elders and true deacons.

If what has been said so far seem credible, we may approach the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus from a new point of view. If we begin our inquiry with them, we have to ask how the distinction between bishops and presbyters ever arose; but if we suppose that before they can have been written the presbyterian and episcopal organizations were both in existence and beginning to overlap, we are prepared for ambiguous language.

A great deal of course depends upon the degree of authority which we can attribute to the Pastoral Epistles. Suppose, for instance, Marcion really knew of a collection of St. Paul's letters which did not include them. What then? Marcion professed—in good or bad faith—to believe that the orthodox of his day appealed to an enlarged interpolated canon or quasi-canon. This makes it more likely than not that the writings he rejected already existed when he began his controversy. The Second Epistle to Timothy bears very strong “internal evidence of genuineness”; as to the other two, there are three possible hypotheses: (a) St. Paul dictated them; (b) somebody (? the editor of the Second Epistle to Timothy) knew of such letters, and had seen them or had fragments of them—(how long would a letter in cheap ink on inferior papyrus remain legible throughout to an average reader?)—or at any rate thought he knew St. Paul's views of Church organization, and put his view on record in that form; (c) somebody of whom it would be quite impossible to approve had views of his own upon Church organization and fathered them upon St. Paul. Nobody would suppose that the picture of Church organization in the *Clementines* exactly reproduces what existed in the circle in which the author or authors moved. It represents his or their theory of what St. Peter instituted. The same observation applies to the Pastoral Epistles if we were reduced, which we are not, to choosing between hypotheses *b* and *c*. It is true, and not very strange, that the most unscrupulous person we can imagine, guessing as late as we can imagine in the second century at St. Paul's ecclesiastical arrangements, was in a better position to be right than we. It is quite possible that somebody trying to make a fair copy of half legible letters some forty years old might be substantially right. It is also possible (nay probable on hypothesis *c*) that in such an enterprise an editor or a writer may have got confused between what he

saw in the present and what he remembered or conjectured of the past. Such an one living in an age mainly episcopal, and remembering an age that by contrast might seem mainly presbyterian, would disguise the transition by his efforts to throw himself back to a point before it.<sup>1</sup>

If we suppose, as is still most probable, that the epistles in question are genuine in the strict sense, we shall suppose that Titus is to ordain elders with all the qualities a bishop ought to have, because each of them may be called upon to act as bishop. We might perhaps conjecture that there was a time during which the Church at large knew of presbyters while the bishops and deacons were hardly known outside the Church or congregation to which they ministered. From this point of view it is imaginable that as there can hardly have been more than one Christian congregation in most Cretan cities, the elders in their corporate capacity were elders of the Church of Crete, while each was bishop of his own city; while at Ephesus, where the faithful were certainly more numerous, the elders of the Church may have been, for all we can guess, bishops, each of his own congregation. Was it so at Philippi, or did the Church there start with more bishops than one, like the pagan guilds, which *perhaps* furnished the pattern for the organization of bishops and deacons?

Wherever and whenever there was a single bishop with deacons under him and a board of presbyters beside him,

<sup>1</sup> One is tempted to suspect a confusion of this kind in a well-known and enigmatical passage of "St. Ignatius," *Ad Smyrn.* xiii. The writer salutes "the virgins who are called widows." The writer knew that there was a body of widows in every Church in the days of St. Ignatius; he knew that in his own day there was in many Churches a number of virgins, some of whom took brevet rank as widows. He knew perhaps that it would have been an anachronism to make St. Ignatius salute the virgins as such at all; certainly it would have been to make him salute them and not the widows, and so he makes him salute those virgins who had taken rank as widows. One cannot suppose he wrote late enough to salute widows as persons who, in a higher judgment than man's, took rank as virgins, for this would imply that the new order of virgins already overshadowed the older order of widows.

the bishop and deacons were rather like the magistrates, and the elders rather like the senate of a provincial municipality; and no doubt one of the strongest points of resemblance was, that elders and senate had, and were meant to have, a certain power of control. This appears even in the Apostolic Ordinances, which in their original form stipulate for two presbyters (? as an irreducible minimum). But by the time of St. Cyprian the presbyters were much more like the assessors who formed the *consilium* of a Roman proconsul. The change is not surprising. If we can trace the distinction between bishops and elders back to the apostolic age, it will follow that in Churches founded afterwards the bishop was the first Church officer appointed. As time went on, and the number of believers increased, he ordained elders and other officials. One wonders whether the office of reader was invented for one or other of the brethren whom the party which St. Clement rebukes had vainly tried to elevate *per saltum* to the bishopric. This would give a point to the exhortations to subordination in the homily, which certainly seems to be by a reader, that has been annexed to St. Clement's letter.

A few words may be added on the question of "succession," and on the theory that the surviving Apostles, or St. John, instituted some new thing, after the fall of Jerusalem or before the end of the first century. The theory of succession was put forward by the Tractarians as a theory of ministerial competence. In St. Irenæus it appears in quite a different connexion. In every apostolic Church there has been a succession of regularly placed and settled ministers, each of whom knew all that his predecessors knew of Christian truth; so that their consent was a perfect guarantee of apostolic doctrine. This still implies,—which was the important point for the Tractarians,—that the first non-apostolic minister of an

apostolic Church was established by an Apostle or Apostles. We may test this by the Third Epistle of St. John. If John the elder be other than John the Apostle, it may be a question which wrote the letter; but it is a genuine though minor monument of the close of the apostolic age. The writer is in close relations with a certain Gaius, who is apparently remarkable for his hospitality to travelling "Apostles," and still in a position to influence a Church controlled by a certain Diotrophes, who will not recognise the writer, and will not allow any member of his assembly to show hospitality to travelling brethren recommended by the writer, who still hopes that, if he comes in person, he will be able to rebuke Diotrophes to some purpose. He has written to the Church, but feels that this is rather waste of time. Obviously the writer rates his authority high, and more than half suspects he has outlived it. But for this, one thinks Gaius might have been upheld in the position which Diotrophes has usurped, though the writer does not take the usurpation very seriously. At worst Diotrophes is an evil-doer, who has not seen God; there is not a hint that he imperils the salvation of his adherents. The impression one gets is, that Diotrophes wished the "Church" that he more or less controlled, and Gaius more or less influenced, to keep itself to itself, not to allow outsiders to sponge upon it or meddle with it. Such an attitude deserved to be rebuked; and yet it might be tolerated in one who taught nothing false or wrong, as the writer to the Hebrews seems at once to rebuke and tolerate the faint-hearted believers who in time of persecution were disposed to give up regular attendance at Christian worship. In the time which is represented by the letters of St. Ignatius, membership of an organized community is the one guarantee of sound faith and morals; as late as Tertullian it is no more. When a Christian finds himself alone, he is still his own priest; he is not dependent upon



a clergyman who comes round once a month or once a quarter. If there are three laymen, he is priest, not for himself only, but for the Church; though elsewhere Tertullian is sarcastic on the irregularities of heretics, who let the same man fill one office one day and another the next. Nor can one be sure that it is more to St. Ignatius. The famous passage about the Eucharist might be compared with the directions of the *Didaché*. Unless the liturgiologists are right, who say the *Didaché* tells us nothing of the Eucharist, that document prescribes a particular rite to everybody but prophets. So one is inclined to ask whether, according to Ignatius, the validity of the Eucharist is guaranteed, not by the rite, but by the authority of the minister; but it hardly follows in either case that the Eucharist is null without the prescribed guarantee.

As soon as there were false teachers in any place as attractive and influential in themselves as the teachers of truth (and unless we are very paradoxical, the Apocalypse proves that this came to pass before the close of the apostolic age) it became urgent for the surviving Apostles, who were mostly too old to travel often or far, to assure each community that they would be sure of the truth if they kept fellowship with the one of their members who had the confidence of the Apostle to whom the Church looked up as its founder. In this way the principle of one bishop in one city might come to be established, if it needed establishing. It would follow that every here and there the principle would be applied late, after all the Apostles had departed; and then it would happen that in course of time the convert of the first generation who had most of their confidence counted as the first bishop, though "monarchical episcopacy" had been introduced later. If Gaius had been connected with a sufficiently important Church, it is probable that when the fashion of reckoning

up "successions" came in (Hegesippus was familiar with it: he says, "I drew up a succession," as though the word already had a technical sense), he might have counted for the first bishop, in which case we should have lost the letter to him, which, as it was, seemed hardly worth collecting. However this be, if we suppose that in the larger and older Churches there was ever anything like a college of co-equal presbyters or bishops, there are two possibilities, not to say probabilities, with which we have to reckon. One is, that they were designated to succeed the original bishop; the other is, that men knew or remembered that in many cities there had been some one person (?like the true yokefellow of Phil. iv. 3?) through whom the apostolic founder had kept up his intercourse with the local Church,—who had been, so to speak, commissary apostolic,—which gave him a certain measure of authority even when other brethren spake with tongues and prophesied. At first, no doubt, every such authority was in the background; the foreground is filled by the gifted members of the Churches, or of the Church universal. When the gifts were withdrawn or were forfeited, then those who had managed the temporal business of the Church came to the front. When the rule of faith and morals came to be in peril, even a constructive apostolic commission was of growing weight. Even in St. Clement's day, it was possible to insist on the Divine right of a positive order which is strong enough to impose delay upon the most legitimate personal ambition founded upon a sense of a Divine selection and confirmed by public recognition.

G. A. SIMCOX.

*PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF  
EDWARD IRVING.*

IN the year 1827 I had occasion to spend a couple of months in London. Mr. Irving was then in the zenith of his popularity as a pulpit orator; and as I had only the year before become a Licentiate of the Church of Scotland, I naturally felt eager to discover what might be the secret of a popularity so unequalled. Admission to his humble place of worship (Caledonian Chapel, Cross Street, Hatton Garden) was by ticket only—a step to which his office-bearers reluctantly resorted to prevent worse consequences, and even ticket-holders had to come long before the hour of service if they would find a seat. Having an introduction to Mr. Nisbet, the well-known publisher and one of his office-bearers, I got from him a right of entrance for the whole period of my stay in London. Coming early the first day, I found the whole of the street lined with carriages, and the church even then rapidly filling. To get a full view of the preacher I worked my way to the front of the gallery, the middle pew of which—treble the depth of the others—had been fitted up for the Caledonian Asylum boys, but was now occupied by people of note, for whom, as pretty constant worshippers, it was reserved. One day, for example, standing immediately behind this pew, I had before me the Duke of Sussex, Mr. Canning, Lord Brougham, Sir James Mackintosh, and others of aristocratic look, whose names I could not learn. All eyes were directed to the pulpit, watching the ascent of the portly figure that was to fill it. And no wonder, for a sight it certainly was. Rarely is such a figure to be seen in pulpit or platform. Isaac Taylor, whose guest he was that very year, took his profile, and having himself been bred an artist, the following is what he wrote underneath the engraving of that profile, prefixed to the first volume of

his *Collected Writings*: "The outline was made with very great care, and the engraving fairly represents it. The head measures one foot in both dimensions. Mr. Irving stood more than six feet in height. His strength was prodigious, and agility surprising." When I got my first sight of him as he stood up in the pulpit—erect, broad-shouldered, full-chested—I could have fancied him an athlete. The head, as it appears in Isaac Taylor's profile, would strike any one as that of no common man, but even the portrait prefixed to the first volume of Mrs. Oliphant's *Life* of him, when he was perhaps a year or two younger than when I first saw him, gives a fair idea of his appearance. His glossy black locks,<sup>1</sup> neatly shaded off in the middle of his broad forehead, added to his attractive appearance, and even the otherwise unpleasant cast in one of his eyes, owing to the benignity of his expression, only gave him a look quite his own.

So much for his personal appearance, which I only notice because it was impossible to dissociate it from his mental self. In fact, almost all who have written about him have felt it necessary to refer to it. As he read out the opening psalm, his clear sonorous voice and distinct articulation, but still more the dignified simplicity and elevated purity of his style in prayer, struck me at once.<sup>2</sup> But his reading of the Scriptures was to me something new. It was not his melodious voice, and the full compass of it, but the *life* which he threw into what he read that seemed to carry his hearers into the very scenes and circumstances of the passage before them, making what was familiar enough to them before seem new. Of the matter of his preaching I will speak in detail further on. At present I will only say

<sup>1</sup> "All his (father's) children," Carlyle says, "had beautifully coal-black hair."—*Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle* (Froude), vol. i., p. 75.

<sup>2</sup> "Even in his last times, with their miserable troubles and confusion, he spoke always with a sonorous, deep tone, like the voice of a man frank and sincere addressing men."—*Reminiscences*, vol. i., p. 86.

that what for years continued to attract unparalleled crowds, largely of the most cultured classes and foremost ranks of society, holding them spell-bound under the voice of a humble Presbyterian minister from Scotland, must have been something very different from mere sensational oratory. Its character, as I shall have occasion to shew, changed considerably with the progress of his views of Divine truth, and not certainly for the better, though it never lost traces of what it was at its best. When I first heard him, it was such as made George Canning in the House of Commons say of one specimen of it, that it was the most eloquent sermon he had ever listened to.<sup>1</sup>

I was introduced to Mr. Irving by Mr. Nisbet, and at his own invitation called on him without delay. He received me so cordially and talked with me so unaffectedly that I felt immediately at home, and I gladly availed myself of his invitation to come again as often during my stay as I could find convenient. These calls seemed to be all the less of an intrusion and were of longer duration, as the subjects started happened to be those on which I had thought and read a good deal and in a line akin to his own.

Mr. Irving had scarcely been two years in London when it became plain to his office-bearers that they must set about the erection of a new church for him, of dimensions and a character very different from the humble chapel which till then had served them. A site was soon got, but owing to protracted difficulties, it was not completed till 1827, when on the 11th May—a few weeks after I had left London—it was opened by Dr. Chalmers. A thousand sittings were immediately taken, and the crowds that had rendered Cross Street, Hatton Garden, so stirring, transferred themselves to Regent's Square. It was said to be the handsomest place of worship which up to that time had been occupied by any Nonconformist minister, and Mr. Irving, who could not

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, by Mrs. Oliphant, vol. i., p. 159.



endure to be regarded as a Dissenter, had it named *The National Scotch Church*.

In the summer of 1828, when Mr. Irving was in the beautiful parishes of Roseneath and Row, Dumbartonshire, and there preaching to immense crowds both in the open air and in church, important communications were held between him and Mr. A. J. Scott, a Licentiate of the Church of Scotland, and son of the Rev. Dr. Scott of Greenock, one of the most esteemed of the elder ministers of the Church. Mr. Irving had met with this young man before; but struck now with the force of his character and his manifest superiority as a thinker, he invited him to be his Assistant in London. This led to a frank disclosure of difficulties in the way of his occupying that position. Though his difficulties were of a doctrinal nature, they were not then, I believe, of a pronounced character, but rather those of a restless, dissatisfied inquirer. Mrs. Oliphant describes him very correctly as "a man whose powerful, wilful, and fastidious mind has produced upon all other capable minds an impression of force and ability which no practical result has yet (in 1862) adequately carried out—" <sup>1</sup> and to the last never did. For his mind, entirely unimagi- native, was rather of the destructive than constructive kind—subtle, incisive, powerful in exposing weaknesses in the reigning conceptions of Bible truth and religious ideas, but never making clear what he would substitute in their room. Mrs. Oliphant wondered what could attract a mind like Irving's to one so totally dissimilar and unaccordant. But besides that these features of Mr. Scott's mind could hardly have discovered themselves at that time, Mr. Irving had a generous admiration of a mind of such independence and rare grasp, while the frankness with which the young man opened to him his difficulties could not fail to win the confidence of one who was himself so simple and open.

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. ii., p. 28.

Accordingly, "notwithstanding this vast difference, so visible now-a-days (writes Mrs. Oliphant, referring to Mr. Scott's eventual *departure from Christianity*) these two dissimilar natures had somehow fallen into warm and sudden friendship; and Irving, all truthful and ingenuous, desiring no pledges about doctrine, and confident in the piety and truth of the young man, engaged the doubtful probationer to join him in London, and be his assistant in his ministerial labours." <sup>1</sup>

For a year and a half Mr. Scott continued in this position, when being called to assist the minister of the Scotch Church at Woolwich, he accepted the call, leaving Mr. Irving alone in his work.

Towards the close of the year 1829 a letter reached me, signed by Mr. Irving and all his office-bearers, inviting me to succeed Mr. Scott as Assistant in Regent's Square church—a position which my parents were not willing I should accept, as it might interfere with my prospects in the Church at home; but after some hesitation I wrote accepting it, and on the 3rd January, 1830, I preached for the first time in Regent's Square. From that time till the memorable morning of the 26th April, 1832—of which I shall have occasion to disclose some things known only to myself—my connexion with Mr. Irving continued unbroken. The events which took place during those two years and three months will be best understood in connexion with the changes which took place in Mr. Irving's views and mode of acting, carrying with them a corresponding change in his preaching.

The staple and style of that oratory which almost immediately after his arrival in London, drew ever-increasing crowds to Cross Street, Hatton Garden, can hardly be apprehended without knowing something of his previous history

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. ii., p. 29.

and of the generous ambition and swelling emotions with which—as though at the long last he had now found his niche—he grasped the call to become minister of the humble Scotch congregation there. And as much of what I have to say in these papers is connected with facts in his early history, I must ask the indulgence of such as know them well, while, for the sake of those who do not, I recall as much as seems necessary for my purpose.

Mrs. Oliphant in her two volumes has made good use of family papers in recording the facts of Irving's early life. But the recent publication by Mr. Froude of Carlyle's *Reminiscences*—whatever may be thought of them in other respects—throws additional light on some of the best phases of Irving's character. In fact, "Reminiscences of Edward Irving" occupy the whole of the first volume of that work, except the first sixty-six pages. Spun out as these *Reminiscences* are by some rather garrulous details about other people, they have all the charm of that inimitable word-painter's style; and, what is remarkable, though that *littérateur* could hardly write about other notabilities of his acquaintance without a spice of cynicism, all that he says about Irving is full of fine feeling and generous estimation.

Edward Irving and Thomas Carlyle were born within a few miles of each other in the county of Dumfries, and both of humble parents; but they had little intercourse with each other till they met at the University of Edinburgh, and not much even then, as Irving was two years in advance of Carlyle. It was at Kirkcaldy that their close intimacy began. They were both teachers, but Irving had been two years there before Carlyle, whose coming to a different school might have excited Irving's jealousy; but he received the newcomer with open arms and made him welcome to his modest library, the best books of which Carlyle devoured. After their work was over, they

had walks and talks together over congenial subjects; and each having genius—though of a very different sort—and both a keen thirst for knowledge and capacity to take in any amount of it, it may easily be imagined how mutually stimulating this would be. “We never wanted,” says Carlyle, “for instructive and pleasant talk while together. He had a most hearty, if not very refined sense of the ludicrous; a broad genial laugh in him always ready. His wide just sympathies, his native sagacities, honest heartedness and good humour made him the most delightful of companions. Such colloquies and such roving about in bright scenes, in talk or silence, I have never had since.”<sup>1</sup>

Carlyle, as well as Irving entered the Divinity Hall, with a view to the ministry of the Church of Scotland; but he soon tired of it and gave it up—from incipient dissatisfaction, probably, even then with what he would have to say he believed. Irving, though agreeing with Carlyle as to the low type of preaching then current, was bent on the pulpit as his proper sphere. Referring to the visits which he as well as his friend used to pay to the Edinburgh clergy, Carlyle says it was at one of these that “his last feeble totter of connexion with Divinity Hall affairs or clerical outlooks was allowed to snap itself and fall definitely to the ground.”<sup>2</sup>

Irving’s first pulpit efforts disappointed all but the very few who saw and appreciated high earnestness and real thought striving to find expression in forms quite new.

“Irving’s preaching as a licentiate,” says Carlyle, “was always interesting to whoever had acquaintance with him, especially to me who was his intimate. Mixed with but little of self-comparison or other dangerous ingredients, indeed with loyal recognition on the part of most of us, and without any grudging or hidden envy, we enjoyed the broad potency of his delineations, exhortations, and free-flowing eloquence, which had all a manly turn. From the first Irving read his discourses, but not in a servile manner; of attitude, gesture, elocution, there

<sup>1</sup> *Reminiscences*, vol. i., pp. 103, 104.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 115.

was no neglect. His voice was very fine; melodious depth, strength and clearness, its chief characteristic. He affected the Miltonic or old English Puritan style, and strove visibly to imitate it more and more till almost the end of his career, when indeed it had become his own, and was the language he used in utmost heat of business for expressing his meaning. We were all taught at that time by Coleridge, etc., that the old English dramatists, divines, philosophers—judicious Hooker, Milton, Sir Thomas Browne—were the genuine exemplars, which I also tried to believe, but never rightly could *as a whole*.”<sup>1</sup>

“In Irving’s preaching there was present or prefigured generous opulence of ability in all kinds (except perhaps the very highest kind not even prefigured).”<sup>2</sup>

Wonderfully accurate as well as graphic is the following :

“Irving’s discourses were far more opulent in ingenious thought than Chalmers’s [referring to the time when he was Dr. Chalmers’s Assistant in Glasgow], which were usually the triumphant onrush of *one* idea, with its satellites and supporters. But Irving’s wanted in definite *head* and *backbone*. That was mostly a defect one felt in traversing those grand forest-avenues of his, with their multifarious outlooks to right and left. He had many thoughts pregnantly expressed, but they did not tend all one way. The reason was, there were in him infinitely more thoughts than in Chalmers, and he took far less pains in setting them forth. The uniform custom was, he shut himself up all Saturday, became invisible all that day: and had his sermon ready before going to bed. Sermons an hour long or more; it could not be done in one day, except as a kind of *extempore* thing. It flowed along, not as a swift flowing river, but as a broad, deep, and bending or meandering one. Sometimes it left on you the impression almost of a fine noteworthy *lake*. Noteworthy always; nobody could mistake it for the discourse of other than an uncommon man. Originality and truth of purpose were undeniable in it, but there was, withal, both in the matter and in the manner, a something that might be suspected of affectation, a noticeable preference and search for striking quaint and ancient locutions; a style modelled on the Miltonic old Puritan. Something too in the delivering which seemed elaborate and of forethought, or might be suspected of seeming so. He (still) always read, but not in the least slavishly; and made abundant, rather strong gesticulations in the right places; voice of the finest and powerfullest,” etc.<sup>3</sup> “Irving was very sanguine, I much the reverse; and had his consciousness of power and had his generous ambitions and forecastings. . . . No man that I have

<sup>1</sup> *Reminiscences*, pp. 119, 120.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 161, 162.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. i., pp. 161-163.



known had a sunnier type of character, or so little of hatred towards any man or thing. . . . Noble Irving! he was the faithful elder brother of my life in those years; generous, wise, beneficent all his dealings and discoursings with me were. Well may I recollect as blessings in my existence those Annan and other visits [to their respective birthplaces], and feel that beyond all other men he was helpful to me when I most needed help."<sup>1</sup>

From such a pen this is high testimony; and how this love of Carlyle for Irving continued to the last I had a touching proof but a few weeks before I had to tear myself away from him. When it became evident that things were fast coming to a head between him and a combination of the trustees of his church and the Presbytery, and one could see in his countenance the sadness of his spirit, he showed me a letter he had just received from his old friend Carlyle, bidding him cheer up, and ending with a fine expression of his love for him and his admiration of those qualities which endeared him to all his friends—in contrast with the insignificance of his opponents.

Getting at length tired of teaching and bent on higher work, he gave up his post at Kirkcaldy, went to Edinburgh, attending science classes at the University and classes for modern languages, and became intimate with the best ministers, such as Mr. (afterwards the eminent Dr.) Gordon and Dr. Andrew Thomson, the latter of whom soon found him a man not to be lost sight of. Keeping steadily before him that high ideal of preaching which he was shaping out for himself, he first made a bonfire of all his old sermons, and then tried to make new ones on a higher model, but with so little success that he had begun to despair, when one day he received an unexpected invitation from Dr. Thomson to preach for him in St. George's, accompanied with the formidable intimation that Dr. Chalmers—who was looking for an assistant in the noble work he was organizing in

<sup>1</sup> *Reminiscences*, pp. 188-89.

Glasgow—was to be present. He preached accordingly, and as was believed with universal satisfaction ; but nothing coming of it for some time, one of those fits of despondency—so well known to young licentiates—came over him, and he was about to start for the Continent, to perfect himself in the modern languages, and perhaps go on mission work to some foreign land. Having first gone to Ireland, he there received a packet of letters, readdressed from his native Annan, one of which was from Dr. Chalmers, inviting him to Glasgow. This issued in an invitation to be Dr. Chalmers's Assistant. "I will preach to them if you think fit (he is reported to have said), but if they bear with my preaching they will be the first people who have borne with it!"<sup>1</sup>

How well they bore with it and how he got on with the poor of the parish—some of them ill-favoured and ill enough inclined to religion as well as sunk in poverty, and how he won upon them by his kindly sympathy and lavish liberality—is well told by Mrs. Oliphant. The ungenial atmosphere which in this work he had to breathe during those winter months was fitted to take down the strength of his gigantic frame ; but he made up wonderfully by his summer rambles, carrying his pack slung upon a stick over his broad shoulders, to the amusement of many, and among others his fellow student Mr. Story, whom he visited at the beautiful parish of Roseneath, Dumbartonshire, of which he had become the minister.

Matters went on quite smoothly with Dr. Chalmers, though the contrast between the licentiate and the idol of the Glasgow people was trying enough ; and a change to anywhere out of this blaze seemed desirable. At length it came, and of a very unanticipated character. The Presbyterian congregation which worshipped in the Caledonian Chapel, Hatton Garden, was then vacant and reduced in numbers

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. i., p. 98.

almost hopelessly. The father of the Session had been deputed to approach Mr. Irving, but with slender hope of his being willing to look at a call from such a handful. "To which (writes Mr. Irving) I answered: If the times permitted and your necessities required, I should not only preach the Gospel without being burdensome to you, but also by the labour of my hands would minister to your wants, and this would I esteem a more honourable degree than to be Archbishop of Canterbury. Being in such a spirit towards one another, the preliminaries were soon arranged—indeed I may say needed no arrangement—and I came up the day before the Christmas of 1821, to make trial of my gifts before the remnant of the congregation which still held together."<sup>1</sup>

Long as this sketch has been, of what Mr. Irving had to go through and how he developed into the great London orator, it will prepare the reader, I think, to apprehend the character of his early ministry there, to understand the fascination which it so quickly had for the crowds of distinguished persons who hung upon his lips for years, and at the same time account for the lashing severity with which hosts of critics came down upon him both as a preacher and a writer.

A word or two here about Mr. Irving's domestic life and habits of study. For nearly two years after his settlement in London Mr. Irving lived a single life. During that time his company was much sought after, particularly by one accomplished gentleman, Mr. Basil Montagu, the well-known editor of Bacon's works.<sup>2</sup> In his family Mr. Irving found a congenial home, and to him he owed his intro-

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. i, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> The dedication of his *Lectures on the Parable of the Sower* to Mr. and Mrs. Basil Montagu is one of those pieces of autobiography (which indeed all his

duction to Coleridge, at whose feet he may be said to have sat for years, drinking in those incomparable outpourings of a man of rarest genius on almost every subject of human thought. Towards the close of his second year in London he married, and ere I saw him he was the father of two children—his firstborn, however, living one year, and the other only two. These events opened in him springs of domestic joy and chastening sorrow which brought out some of the finest features of his character, which to me were very attractive as I watched them in such moments of freedom and familiarity as I then had with him. But during the first year of my assistancy (1830) I was too much occupied with my own duties to see much of him. Even when events brought us more together, his best time for seeing his friends—his breakfast hour, from about eight o'clock—was my worst, living, as we then did, far apart. At ten o'clock he retired to his study, and was no more to be seen till after his dinner-hour, or about three o'clock. He would then ask me to walk and chat with him; and the best talks I ever had with him were on these occasions, when, with hat in hand, in the open fields, he would give free play, not to his mind only, but his noble physique—which, being once or twice observed, was set down to a wish to attract attention, while our whole talk at such times convinced me that he was unconscious of any presence but our two selves. All subjects of common interest were then turned over, and he would try to draw me out; and when anything I happened to say struck him, he would drink it in with a humility that touched me. One such case I remember. He had quoted those words of our Lord: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you,

Prefaces are) in which he takes the public into his confidence with a childish simplicity (unpardonable egotism, his ill-natured critics called it), about all he was doing, thinking, and feeling at the time.

That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven" (Matt. xviii. 10); and he asked me what that might mean. After a pause, I said: "What would you say to this? None are allowed to enter without leave into the presence of our sovereign; but the nurses of the royal children have free access whenever they have anything to say about the children." "That's worth a talent of gold," he said. Of Mrs. Irving all I then saw was just enough to shew that she lived in the light of her husband's countenance; but to what extent she was able to enter intelligently into his ideas, I had no means of judging till long after.

DAVID BROWN.

### DR. DELITZSCH'S ASSYRIAN DICTIONARY.

FOR ten long years has the little band of Assyrian students been waiting for Delitzsch's *Assyrische Wörterbuch*;<sup>1</sup> and now that the first part has actually appeared, it is a question whether it supplies any want known to Assyriologists. When we remember the many visits which Delitzsch has made to this country, ostensibly for the purpose of copying texts, verifying references, and collecting material generally, our expectation ran high upon the great benefits which we were to receive from his work. Judging by his reviews of books by other students, we all imagined that the advent of his work would mark the beginning of an Assyrian millennium, that crooked texts would be made straight, that all difficulties would be solved, and finally that our souls, hitherto vexed by comparative Semitic philology, might bask and rest themselves in the full light of the learning of the Leipzig professor. How sorely we are disappointed in our expectations we will now show.

The first part of this *Wörterbuch* consists of 168 autographed pages; the writing is plain, neat, and regular. Now the first use

<sup>1</sup> *Assyrisches Wörterbuch zur gesamten bisher veröffentlichten Keilschrift literatur unter Berücksichtigung zahlreicher unveröffentlichter Texte.* Von Friedrich Delitzsch. Erste Lieferung. Henrich's, Leipzig, 1887. 4to.



of a dictionary is for beginners who are trying to learn a new language, and dictionaries are usually accompanied by a "preface" or statement, in which the plan and method of work followed by the writer are explained, and instructions are given for the use of the work. In Delitzsch's book however no words of direction are added for the use of the student, no list of Assyrian or Babylonian signs is given, and the helpless beginner is left to flounder about and find his way as best he can. An Assyrian Dictionary coming forth with such pretensions as those assumed by that of Delitzsch should have begun with an historical account of Assyrian lexicography, and a plain statement of what has been done before in this branch of research by such men as Norris and Strassmaier. Following this, a sketch of the proposed contents of the book should have been given, and then a complete list of the Assyrian and Babylonian signs which occur in the work, with their phonetic values, etc. The list of books and texts mentioned by Delitzsch as having been laid under contribution by him for his *Wörterbuch* is, on the whole, good; it is however incomplete. He has omitted to use the copies of the Liverpool collection of contract tablets made by the Rev. Dr. Strassmaier, and published in the *Transactions* of the Oriental Congress held at Leyden in year 1883; and so far as we can see he either does not know of or cannot read the copies of the "case-tablets," published by Strassmaier in the *Transactions* of the Oriental Congress held at Berlin. These are serious omissions, for this last class of texts is most important for grammatical forms, and is peculiarly rich in Biblical proper names found in the seal inscriptions impressed on the tablets.

The more we go over Delitzsch's work, the less need do we see for its appearance, and the more certain we are that he is quite unqualified for the task he has undertaken. The student already had Norris' and Strassmaier's Dictionaries, besides the most valuable syllabary published by Sayce in his *Assyrian Grammar*. It is true that Norris' work is incomplete, but then Strassmaier's is not, and as he has gone over the same ground as Delitzsch we fail to see why he brought his book out. Now the writer or compiler of an Assyrian Dictionary needs two qualifications, which are rarely met with in one person; we mean: 1, an accurate knowledge of Assyrian epigraphy; 2, a good knowledge of the Semitic dialects allied to Assyrian. Prof. Nöldeke has shown in a masterly article on Delitzsch's *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen*

*Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*<sup>1</sup> that when he attempts to discuss comparative Semitic philology, his deductions and conclusions are generally forced, and often wrong; and, in short, proves plainly that he does not possess the second of the two needful qualifications for making an Assyrian Dictionary enumerated above. Throughout the first part of his work Delitzsch has given "part copies" of texts which he considers of great importance, and which contain uncommon words. These "part copies" are very unsatisfactory, for they are part transcript into ordinary letters, and part are attempted representation of the signs on the tablets. This system of making "part copies" is to be much condemned, for it necessarily leads to bad mistakes. No Arabist, Hebraist, or Syriac scholar attempts to copy a text by transcription into Roman letters; and if this practice is found to be faulty when a language having a limited number of letters in its alphabet is concerned, how much more is it so in the use of a language having many hundreds of complex signs? But to return. One of the texts which Delitzsch so publishes in his *Wörterbuch* (pp. 114, 115) is taken from a beautifully written report tablet, 3 ins. by 1 $\frac{3}{8}$  in., of the time of Assur-bani-pal, bearing the No. K. 525 in the British Museum collection. The greater part of the text has been published by Strassmaier, who quotes it in his *Verzeichniss* thirty-five (!) times.<sup>2</sup> In spite of this help afforded by the *Verzeichniss* Delitzsch has managed to make no fewer than twenty mistakes in a little text of forty-four lines of beautifully clear and distinct Assyrian script. The passages which we now quote will show the reader what reliance is to be placed on Delitzsch's copies.

Line 6. The last sign in this line, he says, is erased (*radirt?*); it is not so, but most clear.

Line 9. The sixth sign he has failed to copy at all. It is *lib*, and the following *bi*, had he understood the text, would have shown him how to read the word. The last three signs of this line he has represented as being partly erased; they read *šu-u-tu*, which is another form of *šuat*, and means "this"; Delitzsch has made the same mistake in line 35. These signs are clear, and we cannot at all understand how he could read *šu-num* out of his own copy *su-mu-tu*.

Line 12. The sixth sign of this line is *ša*, and is not erased.

<sup>1</sup> See *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen Gesell.*, vol xl., pt. iv., pp. 718-743.

<sup>2</sup> For a list of the pages where the tablet is quoted see Bezold, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 264.

The eighth sign is *ma*, and not *gis*; here again, if he had understood the text, the words *ina ma-har-ti* would have given him the correct reading.

Line 16. He gives the last sign as *ut*, and adds an erasure. On the margin he gives *ka*! and adds "*braucht nichts weiter zu fehlen.*" The sign which he reads *ut* does not occur in the line at all, which finishes with the word '*matu*,' 'country.' The reason of Delitzsch's blunder is this: On the reverse of the tablet, at the end of the line which touches the end of line 16 on the obverse, the scribe wrote *bi-ši*, but afterwards erased both these characters. The sign *ši*, upside down, Delitzsch first read *ut*, and afterwards *ka*, clearly not recognising the state of the case, nor noticing that his reading made nonsense.

Line 17. The third sign of this line is represented by Delitzsch as broken. It is quite clear, however, on the tablet, and is to be read *dag*, and forms part of the word *mad-dag-giš*, which occurs on other tablets. In a remark on the margin he describes *dag* as a "*sign like bitu*"!! The last sign but one in the line is *še*, but Delitzsch has copied it wrongly, and then queries *man*! in the margin.

Line 18. The sixth and seventh signs of this line Delitzsch reads *ina* 15 *šal*. The two signs are however *ištu pan*, and are perfectly clear on the tablet. These words occur at the beginning of the line, and it is only too evident that Delitzsch blundered through not understanding the text.

Line 25. Delitzsch gives the last sign but one in the line as erased; it is not so.

Line 26. The last sign cannot be *tu*, as he suggests.

Line 38. Delitzsch thinks that at the end of this line there is an erased *ša*; the sign is however *a* for *ia*, and is often met with in this class of tablet.

Line 40. The fourth sign Delitzsch reads *ina* 15, instead of *šur*, which is the ideograph for the land of Assyria. This is a part of the proper name, *Šur-bi-su-nu*.

Now if Delitzsch makes all these mistakes in copying a text which had been before almost completely published, how many would he make in one which he attempted to copy for the first time? It must be remembered too that the tablet is written in Assyrian, and not Babylonian; had it been written in the latter script, much might have been forgiven him, for his incapacity in copying Babylonian is well known. The above facts as to his

skill and accuracy in copying Assyrian speak for themselves, and we think that we have proved conclusively that he does not possess the more important of the two great needs for successfully making an Assyrian Dictionary; namely, the power of copying texts correctly.

In lines 15, 23, and 32 of the text which we have just discussed the word *té-gir-té* occurs. Delitzsch's article on the word on p. 113 of his *Wörterbuch* tells us that it does occur in these lines of the text; it even describes the tablet, K 525, its style of writing, etc.: but we look in vain for any explanation of the word, neither is there any suggestion as to its probable meaning. Of what use is a dictionary which helps the beginner no more than this? Since all the references were given by Strassmaier's *Verzeichniss*, why print them all over again?

Dr. Delitzsch has taken upon himself to inform Bible students and Semitic scholars of the importance of the study of Assyrian for the right understanding of their own special subjects; yet as we turn over page after page of his lucubrations we are infinitely surprised at the few comparisons drawn between Assyrian and the other Semitic dialects. Many of the other texts published by Delitzsch in his *Transcriptionsmethode* are as faulty as that discussed above (particularly S. 1064, p. 163), but want of space forbids reference to them here. We close the first part of the *Assyrisches Wörterbuch* with much disappointment, and are sorry to think how much the difficulty of learning Assyrian will be increased by the inaccuracies of copying and the misrepresentations which Delitzsch prints in his work.

E.

---

### RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE most important addition which has been made to expository literature during the past months is without doubt Dr. Ellicott's long-expected commentary on 1 Corinthians.<sup>1</sup> We give it the highest praise possible when we say that it is worthy of previous volumes from the same hand. It is in the truest sense a continua-

<sup>1</sup> *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. With a Critical and Grammatical Commentary.* By Charles J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. (Longmans, 1887.)

tion of these volumes. The style of treatment is the same; there is the same solidity in the material, the same finish in the workmanship. The same authorities are cited with one or two notable additions; and there is no alteration in the author's attachment to Klotz' *Devarius*, Hartung's *Partikel-lehre*, and Donaldson's *Greek Grammar*, on the one hand; or, on the other, to Hooker, Hammond, Pearson, and Sanderson. In his theology certainly Dr. Ellicott is of those who think "the old is better." One feature of the previous volumes however is wanting in this, the exact and luminous translation which used regularly to appear at the end of the commentary. These translations were designed, Dr. Ellicott informs us, to be "humble contributions to that which has rendered their further continuance unnecessary,—the Revised Version of the New Testament. When that which is complete has appeared, that which is in part may disappear." In his formation of a text and his mode of exhibiting his authority for it, Dr. Ellicott follows a system which is much to be commended. "It is really very undesirable to bewilder the inexperienced student by long lists of authorities, avowedly taken bodily from Tregelles or Tischendorf, when really all he wants is an intelligent and impartial judgment formed on them by the expositor whom he is consulting. He is also thankful to know what judgment has been arrived at by the few professed critics that have given us editions of the sacred text. These two most reasonable needs on the part of the student I have endeavoured to meet."

Irrespective of the conclusions at which Dr. Ellicott arrives—and of these each reader will form his own opinion—his method is of the utmost value as a training to all students of Scripture. To work through any of Dr. Ellicott's volumes, consulting the authorities he cites, weighing the evidence he adduces, considering the points of grammar, language, and theology he handles, is the best possible education for an expositor. Faith in the fulness and significance of the text, exactness of observation and fineness in discriminating, enlarged knowledge of language and of thought, are rapidly accumulated as the tiro strives to walk alongside of this master of interpretation. Too severe a precisian in grammar, a shade dry in his theology, recognisably Anglican, lacking the originality of Evans and something of the breadth and Paulinism of Edwards, Dr. Ellicott yet gives us work which in its own kind is final, and which he should be as thankful to have given us as we are thankful to get it. In almost no other branch of literature



or of art can we point to work which has so much of the severe exactness and minute finish of scientific work. And those who are alive to the dangers of the vague, irresponsible, lawless, tentative character of much that at present passes for theology will understand the value of work that is scientific, definite, thoroughly grounded in the minutest detail.

Dr. Paley's *Translation of the Gospel of St. John*<sup>1</sup> will disappoint all readers (unless he has enemies) and sadden many. That a scholar who, with some eccentricities of scholarship, has yet done so much to advance and popularize the study of the Greek classics, and whose name has been a guarantee for sound and reliable work, should crown his labours with such a performance as this is most seriously to be regretted. Of the translation one may judge by some of the opening verses: "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was in relation to God, and the Logos was God. It was *he* who at the first stood in relation to God. . . . And the light illuminates in the dark, and the darkness overtook it not." To this latter verse the note is appended: "In a country and neighbourhood in which sun-worship was the ancient religion, not a few terms, and even ideas, may well be supposed to have passed into Christianity from the solar cult. Here, as in 1 John ii., light and darkness are represented as in conflict. For the old-world belief was, that the dragon of darkness pursued the sun to devour it." Could anything be more crude and savour less of exact scholarship than such a note? Yet this dragon of allusions to solar mythology pursues the unfortunate annotator throughout the gospel, and devours his common sense. Truly some sense of humour as well as some sympathy with his subject is needful in a translator. Nor with all his protestations can Dr. Paley be acquitted of a certain amount of bias in his notes, and a considerable amount of unworthy insinuation against preceding annotators on this Gospel. "From the orthodox point of view," he says, "Canon Westcott's well-known edition of this Gospel, with its ample commentary, will satisfy every theological student. It was not his object to raise difficulties in the narrative, or to point out the parallels, often extremely striking, in heathen mythology, or to say a word about sun-worship or fish-worship, and the portents connected with them.

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel of St. John. A verbatim Translation from the Vatican MS., with . . . brief Explanatory Comments.* By F. A. Paley, M.A., LL.D. (Swan Sonnenschein, 1887.)

This is forbidden ground. No one expects to hear from the pulpit, no one ever reads in a theological treatise, of extending the science of comparative mythology so as to include the kindred beliefs of the traditional theology. For myself, I have long been very much struck with, and I have learned heartily to despise, that *suppressio veri* which is but too characteristic of professed orthodoxy." One who patronises Dr. Westcott, despises the methods of traditional theology, and is loftily hopeless of hearing truth from the pulpit, creates expectations in his readers, which a few perverse and groundless references to solar mythology scarcely fulfil.

Prebendary Row's laborious treatise on *Future Retribution*<sup>1</sup> will not materially influence the opinions of thoughtful men. Its English is careless, its scholarship inadequate, its criticism of philosophical and theological theories superficial, and its own thinking amazingly crude. Of its English here are specimens: "There are a very numerous class of actions," "these systems evaporate the idea of duty of all meaning," "the writings would have failed to have conveyed [he means, *to convey*] to the latter the meaning," etc. Its scholarship may be inferred from its two findings regarding the word *αἰών*, of which it is affirmed, on the one hand, that it cannot, even in popular language, convey the idea of endlessness, and, on the other hand, that "when it is united with a term denoting negation, it is then capable of expressing the idea of duration without limits." The chapter in which this word is treated will be read with astonishment by scholars. How much more profitable it would have been for the reader had Mr. Row merely quoted the standard lexicons! But, unfortunately, the authoritative lexicographers, Grimm, Schirlitz, and Cremer, all define the word so as to quite cut the ground from his position. It would also have been much preferable to omit criticism of antagonistic theories, rather than to pretend to dispose of Calvinism in half a page, or to attack altruism in language which merely exposes the thinness and unreality of his own philosophical creed. Mr. Row's own theory is that human personality survives the dissolution of the body, that human probation is not in all cases terminated at death, but that even after an extended probation some will be found impenitent, and will be annihilated. To the support of these conclusions nothing is brought which has not become familiar to every mind that has

<sup>1</sup> *Future Retribution viewed in the Light of Reason and Revelation.* By C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. (Isbister & Co., 1887.)

been exercised on the subject. The reader will find here no attempt to bring these conclusions into harmony with a philosophical conception of the world, and of man's place in it; no attempt even clearly to ascertain the actual incidence of retribution, no fruitful suggestions regarding the grounds of final judgment and the laws which regulate the growth of character—in fact, no real entrance into the heart of the subject.

Twenty years ago, Mr. Frederic Seebohm, in his charming volume, *The Oxford Reformers*, assigned to Dean Colet his true and important place in the history of the Reformation and of England. And now from the trained and loving hand of Mr. Lupton we have a full-length portrait of this interesting and significant figure, the friend of Erasmus and More, the admired "doctor" of Henry VIII., the founder of St. Paul's School, the reformer of education in England, the commentator on St. Paul's epistles, the bold censor of the abuses of his time, and one of the most sincere and devoted of men. For giving us this portrait Mr. Lupton has had the best preparation. To his long-continued diligence we owe careful editions and translations of the hitherto unpublished and inaccessible works of Colet. But these six volumes necessarily appeal only to historical or theological students, and we trust that the devotion which Mr. Lupton has shown in so carefully editing them will be rewarded by the reception accorded to his *Life of Dean Colet*.<sup>1</sup> Certainly it is worthy of a wide circulation. It is the work of one whose mind is steeped in the literature of the period, and who is able, by his knowledge of details, to reproduce the period in a most instructive manner. Besides being a most interesting biography, it thus becomes a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the condition of England in the years immediately preceding the Reformation. The attitude of Colet towards the Church was similar to that of his friends More and Erasmus, and very possibly had he lived a few years longer (he died in 1519) it would have been found that he had the same reluctance to break with the old Church. But the admiration he has excited has been exceptionally unsectarian, and as Mr. Lupton shows, "in his many-sided character there is something in which all may claim a share." His commentaries have little but antiquarian or historical interest, but his letters and conversations are

<sup>1</sup> *A Life of John Colet, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, and Founder of St. Paul's School.* By J. H. Lupton, M.A., Surmaster of St. Paul's School. (George Bell & Sons, 1887.)

in the highest degree suggestive. His permanent monument is St. Paul's School, where his *Oratiuncula ad Puerum Jesum Scholæ Præsidem* is still in daily use.

Mr. Tuck's *Handbook of Biblical Difficulties* deserves a hearty welcome and a wide circulation. It forms a very complete dictionary or cyclopædia of the passages in Scripture most likely to stumble a reader. Solutions have been culled from the most authoritative writers, and, as readers of Mr. Tuck's previous volumes would expect, his own views are always worthy of attention. No book more likely to be helpful to Sunday-school teachers and to ministers whose libraries are of limited dimensions has appeared in recent times. The publisher is Elliot Stock.—Another book intended to aid teachers of Bible-classes comes to us from the Bishop of Liverpool's examining chaplain, Principal Waller. It is entitled *A Handbook to the Epistles of St. Paul*, and consists mainly of a description of the contents of the epistles. The publishers are John F. Shaw & Co.—To his already voluminous writings Prebendary Sadler adds a volume on *The Acts of the Apostles* (George Bell & Sons). As was to be expected, this commentary is somewhat marred by the obtrusion of high sacramentarian views; but with this deduction it is likely to be useful. It is prepared for English readers, and embraces a large amount of homiletical suggestion, together with a careful and scholarly examination of the text.—Mr. Banks, of the Wesleyan College at Headingley, to whom we owe the two useful pamphlets, *A Preacher's Library* and *A Preacher's General Reading*, has published a *Manual of Christian Doctrine* (Woolmer). It is of course written from the Wesleyan point of view, but it is well-informed and fair, and may aid the studies of many who do not belong to that denomination.—We have also received a new volume of the "Epochs of Church History" series (Longmans). It is entitled *The Church of the Early Fathers* (External History), and is by Alfred Plummer, D.D., of Durham. We are doubtful of the use of history written on this scale. Students should go first to the larger authorities, and then to the sources; or *vice versâ*. But for readers who have not time for this, and who yet seek some acquaintance with Church history, this volume will be found suitable. It shows marks of compression and even hasty composition, but it is accurate and intelligent and impartial.—*Godliness and Manliness* is the somewhat misleading title which the Rev. John W. Diggle, M.A., has given to a miscellany of

brief papers on such subjects as the "Educational Value of Miracles," the "Character of Mosaic Legislation," "Baptismal Regeneration," "Rewards and Punishment," "The Pleasantness of Religion," and so forth. His thoughts are sound, and are expressed in a manly style, but we doubt if the form of his book is the best. Unless detached thoughts or brief papers are of the highest originality they fail to win the public ear. (The publishers are Messrs. Macmillan & Co.)—A book of the same kind, and of considerable value, is published anonymously by Elliot Stock under the title *Jottings of a Truth-seeker*. It is a hand-book of liberal theology, and it frankly expresses the beliefs and opinions to which the truth-seeker has attained. The writer is evidently a layman, and some of his thoughts are crude; but his face is turned in the right direction, and the expression of his opinions may strengthen some inquirer who has hitherto felt that in parting company with orthodoxy he may be abandoning religion. The *Jottings* need sifting, but they are of much value, both for the truth they contain and as an indication of the welcome fact that man after man is finding for himself a true and reasonable religion in Christianity, underneath all the excrescences which have overgrown it and the symbols which have both preserved and disguised it.—A collection of the sermons preached before the Queen by the late Principal Tulloch is published by Messrs. Nisbet. *Sundays at Balmoral* were well spent in listening to these sermons. They are thoughtful and earnest utterances on some of the most important aspects of the spiritual life; in their material substantial and in spirit evangelical and devout.—But standing quite by itself as a solid result of original research, and deserving a much more elaborate notice than can here be given it, is Dr. Edwin Hatch's *The Growth of Church Institutions* (Hodder and Stoughton), a book stiff with significant facts and bursting with inferences. The institutions whose growth is here described are "The Diocesan Bishop," "The Payment of Tithes," "The Benefice," "The Canonical Rule," "The Cathedral Chapter," etc., and even the initiated will welcome so clear and interesting a sketch of their growth as is furnished in Dr. Hatch's volume. Many passages we should like to quote, but quotation is needless, as the book is sure to be widely read; and certainly no one can persuade himself he understands the organization of the Church unless he masters the history so laboriously unearthed and so distinctly presented by Dr. Hatch.—Another book of quite ex-



ceptional value is Mr. Wilson's *Essays and Addresses*. (An attempt to treat some religious questions in a scientific spirit; published by Macmillan.) The subjects dealt with in the essays are various, but they are almost all more or less apologetic in character. They vary in value. The argument of the first essay seems of doubtful cogency, and the position assumed by Mr. Wilson in his paper on miracles will not be universally accepted. But no more important or timely contribution has been made to apologetic literature in our day than the "Letter to a Bristol Artisan," in which the misconceptions of secularists regarding the beliefs of enlightened Christians are exposed in the most trenchant and yet most winning manner. No happier example has ever been given of the right temper and attitude of the Christian apologist; and the nature of the Old Testament and its function and place in revelation have never been so lucidly and validly expounded. This paper and that on "Morality in Public Schools" should be separately printed and circulated in tens of thousands.—We have also received (from Messrs. T. & T. Clark) Dr. Harris' *Self-Revelation of God*, a book whose size will repel many, but which will be found anything but heavy reading by those who boldly attack it. It is a full, well-informed, and convincing discussion of a most important subject by a writer of decided philosophical ability. The fulness of treatment is by no means a disadvantage, for so much has recently been written on the knowledge we have of God, that it is quite time to collect scattered opinions and present in a well-digested survey all significant utterances, and pronounce upon them. The student who accepts Dr. Harris as his teacher will find himself in most efficient hands; and by thoroughly mastering this volume will save himself the trouble of perusing many others. Certainly it is a volume which no one interested in philosophy or apologetics can afford to neglect.—The same publishers send us an *Apologia ad Hebræos, The Epistle (and Gospel) to the Hebrews*, by Zenas. The lawyer who veils his identity while he indicates his profession by this pseudonym would have saved much misspent labour and ingenuity had he consulted any standard work on introduction. There are many open questions which his industry and acuteness might have been serviceable in answering, but whether Luke was at once Lucius of Cyrene and Alexander who appeared in the Ephesian riot is not an open question. We welcome a new worker in the field; but if his unusual mental vigour is to be used for the elucidation of

the New Testament, he must make himself more familiar with Greek and with the hard-earned results of other men's toil. The book is not devoid of interesting and suggestive remarks, but it is marred by impossible theories.—To the already enormous library of books on Augustine has been added the *Augustinische Studien*, von Hermann Reuter (Gotha: Perthes). Of these studies there are seven, five of which have already appeared in Brieger's *Journal of Church History*, and are now reprinted in a revised and enlarged form. They discuss Augustine's doctrine of the Church, and the relation of this doctrine to the other parts of his system. The studies are original and vigorous, and many commonly received interpretations of Augustine's thought are controverted.—A word of cordial welcome is due to another volume of patristic studies, Dr. Charles Bigg's *Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (Clarendon Press). In selecting a subject for his Bampton Lectures Dr. Bigg could scarcely have chosen a more interesting period than that in which heathen and Christian learning strove to amalgamate in the catechetical school of Alexandria. Certainly he chose a subject which he was abundantly competent to handle. We possess critical biographies and monographs in ecclesiastical history which give us more pages on Philo, Clement, and Origen, but none which so satisfactorily brings before the reader the essentials of their teaching. Much as we are now-a-days accustomed to the full citation of authorities, Dr. Bigg's reading and learning seem to us surprising. Neither will capacity for original and suggestive thought be denied to the writer who can afford to scatter in his notes observations such as this: "Stoicism thrived because, like Christianity, it is a philosophy of suffering: it fell because, unlike Christianity, it is a philosophy of despair."

MARCUS DODS.

SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF  
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

V. VIVID DETAILS: LOCAL AND TEMPORAL COLOURING.

1. WE have seen how the R.V. enables the English reader to gain a clearer view of the exact form of the original Greek by preserving significant identities of language and by marking significant differences. In this way light is thrown upon the relations of the evangelic narratives one to another, and upon the manifold expression of apostolic teaching. At the same time minute faithfulness of rendering brings out innumerable details of vivid description, and of local and temporal colouring, which convey a living sense of the direct originality of the writings.

2. Sometimes the effect of the change in translation is obvious at once. A vague or general phrase is filled with a fresh force by the restoration of the original image. Thus in John xvi. 2, the substitution of the fuller rendering, *The hour cometh, that (iva) whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God*, for the colourless *doeth God service*, brings out the thought that the persecution of Christians to death would be regarded as an act of religious devotion, according to the saying, "Every one that sheds the blood of the wicked is as he that offereth an offering." In Gal. vi. 17, the addition of the word *branded*—*I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus*—points the reference to the slaves who bore the names of the deities to whose service they were consecrated. The marks of the scourges and the stones were for St. Paul the indelible brands of his absolute devotion to his Lord. In 2 Cor. ii. 14, the whole

thought is inverted by the rendering of A.V., *Thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ*. The gratitude of the apostle is poured out characteristically not for his own triumph, but for Christ's triumph. He thanks God, not that he has conquered, but that he has been conquered. His joy is that he is *led in triumph in Christ* as one of those whom Christ has taken captive (comp. Col. ii. 15). In Heb. ii. 1 a new word is introduced to express a new and startling thought: *We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard*, lest haply we drift away from them (A.V. lest we should let them slip). The peril of the Hebrews lay in that stream of habit and circumstance which is ever tending to bear us along with it, if our watchfulness is relaxed. Again in the same epistle (xi. 13), the faith of the patriarchs appears in its full energy when we read that *these all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar* (A.V. having seen them afar off . . . and embraced them). Like wayworn wanderers, they recognised their God-given home.

"Italian primus conclamat Achates,  
Italian laeto socii clamore salutant."

So too in 1 Pet. v. 5 humility is now shown as the indispensable condition for service which the Christian must resolutely assume: *gird yourselves with humility* (A.V. *be clothed with humility*).

3. Expressive touches will be no less plainly recognised in the following passages:

Mark x. 21 f, *Jesus looking upon* (A.V. beholding) *him loved him, and said*. . . . *But his countenance fell at the saying* (A.V. he was sad at that saying). The thought is of the soul-piercing glance by which the character is laid open (comp. v. 27, xiv. 67; Luke xx. 17, xxii. 61; John i. 36, 42), and of the cloud which overshadows the man who cannot receive the call to self-surrender (cf. Matt. xvi. 3 v.l.).

Luke i. 52, *He hath put down princes from their thrones* (A.V. *the mighty from their seats*).

Luke xix. 48, *The people all hung upon Him, listening* (A.V. *all the people were very attentive to hear Him*). The unique expression (*ἐξεκρέματο*) is a transcript from life.

Acts xx. 35, *In all things I gave you an example, how that so labouring . . .* (A.V. *I have showed you all things, how that . . .*). The whole conception of the apostolic pattern (*v.* 34) disappears from A.V.

1 Cor. ix. 27, *I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means . . . I myself should be rejected* (A.V. *I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means . . . I myself should be a castaway*). The vigour of St. Paul's language in the first clause is lost in A.V., and in the second clause an image is suggested wholly foreign to the original thought of trial and judgment (*Heb.* vi. 8).

2 Cor. iv. 8, *We are pressed on every side, yet not straitened* (A.V. *we are troubled on every side, yet not distressed*). The image is kept in R.V. and also the rendering of an unusual word (*στενοχωρεῖσθαι*), which is given in the other place where it occurs (*vi.* 12).

2 Cor. vii. 2, 4, *Open your hearts to us. . . . I overflow with joy in all our affliction* (A.V. *Receive us. . . . I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulation*).

Col. ii. 14, *The bond written in ordinances that was against us* (A.V. *the handwriting of ordinances, that was against us*).

1 Thess. ii. 17, *Being bereaved of you for a short season,* (A.V. *Being taken from you for a short time*). The suggestion of the relation of parent and child, on which St. Paul delights to dwell (*Gal.* iv. 19; *1 Cor.* iv. 15; *Philem.* 10), is essential to the understanding of the tenderness of the Apostle's words (*comp.* *John* xiv. 18).

2 Tim. i. 8, *Suffer hardship with the gospel* (A.V. *be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel*). The charac-



teristic personification of the gospel ought not to be lost or obscured (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 9).

2 Tim. ii. 4 f, No soldier on service *entangleth himself; . . . that he may please him who enrolled him as a soldier. And if also a man contend in the games . . .* (A.V. No man that warreth, *entangleth himself; . . . that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier. And if a man also strive for masteries. . . .* The urgency of a present campaign, and the force of the second image are obliterated in A.V.

Rev. vii. 15, *He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His tabernacle over them* (A.V. *shall dwell among them*). Comp. Isa. iv. 5 f; Rev. xxi. 3.

4. Sometimes, as will perhaps appear even from the illustrations which have been already given, some reflection is required before the full significance of the original imagery is realised. In the parable of the sower it cannot be unimportant that persons are identified with the seed sown (Matt. xiii. 19 ff, *he that was sown*, not, as A.V., *he that received seed*). The completeness of the disciples' sacrifice is shown in the figure, *the cup that I drink* (not, as A.V., drink of) *ye shall drink* (Mark x. 38 f). The measure of suffering must be drained to the last (comp. John xviii. 11). Love rejoiceth not simply *in the truth* (A.V.), but *with the truth* (1 Cor. xiii. 6). Truth, no less than love, is a minister of God, who has her own sorrows and her own victories. It cannot be otherwise, for at present *we see in a mirror* (A.V. through a glass) *darkly* (literally *in a riddle*): we look upon that which is only a reflection, and not the very object of our desire; and this reflection itself is a parable, and suggests far more than it plainly shows. There is also a double use of the Divine gifts as being a supply for the personal needs of those who receive them, and a means whereby they may in turn make provision for the needs of those who shall come after them—food at once and seed. This thought, lost in A.V.

is now marked in 2 Cor. ix. 10 (comp. Isa. lv. 10 ff) for the careful reader: *He that supplieth seed to the sower and bread for food, shall supply and multiply your seed for sowing, and increase the fruits of your righteousness.* We have become familiar with the true meaning of "mystery," a Divine truth made known to the members of a sacred brotherhood, and once St. Paul uses the corresponding verb: *I have learned* (ἐμαθον), he writes, *to be content. . . . In all things have I learned the secret* (μυστήματα) *to be filled and to be hungry . . .* (Phil. iv. 11, 12). A remarkable change of reading in Jas. iv. 4 will furnish another illustration. In place of the common text, *Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?* we now have, *Ye adulteresses, know ye not . . .?* The superficial harshness of the figure disappears when we recall the teaching of the prophets. Israel is the bride of the Lord. The unbelief of the chosen people is the guilt of a faithless wife. So the characteristic voice of the Old Testament is heard once again through the apostolic writing which most directly represents its style. In Jude 12, which offers other remarkable corrections in R.V., another prophetic phrase now finds a place in the description of false teachers: *These are they who are hidden rocks in your lovefeasts when they feast with you, shepherds that without fear feed themselves* (Ezek. xxxiv.).<sup>1</sup>

5. Not unfrequently the faithful reproduction of the original form of thought serves to convey an impressive revelation of the strength, the obligations, the perils of the Christian life. Perhaps there is no word of the Lord which opens a deeper vision of the harmonies of redemption than that which is at length restored to its true form in John

<sup>1</sup> Any one who will carefully study in detail the changes introduced into John xiii. 22 ff (comp. xxi. 20) and 1 Cor. ix. 25-27—to take two passages widely removed from one another—will be able to judge of the importance of such minute variations as we are now considering for the general effect of the translation.

x. 14f: *I am the good Shepherd: and I know Mine own, and Mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father.* The relation of the Son to the Father is the pattern of the relation of those that are Christ's to Christ. The proclamation of such a truth is a paramount obligation upon all to whom it is given. So St. Paul can say (1 Cor. ix. 17; comp. iv. 1): *If I do this . . . not of mine own will, I have a stewardship entrusted to me* (A.V. a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me). The Christian himself, as he contemplates the truth, is slowly transfigured by it: *We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror* (A.V. *with open face* beholding as in a glass) *the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory* (2 Cor. iii. 18). This fact gives emphasis to the charge that we should be not *followers* only (A.V.), but *imitators* (*μιμηταί*) of God (1 Cor. xi. 1, Eph. v. 1, 1 Thess. i. 6) and of His chosen apostles (1 Cor. iv. 16, 1 Thess. ii. 14, Heb. vi. 12). Such an end alters the character of Christian ambition. *We* make it our aim (marg. "Gk., are ambitious"), St. Paul writes, *to be well-pleasing unto [the Lord]* (2 Cor. v. 9, *φιλοτιμούμεθα*; comp. Rom. xv. 20, 1 Thess. iv. 11). And so the rest to which the believer looks forward is a rest answering to the rest of God, *a sabbath rest* (Heb. iv. 9; contrast v. 10). In this connexion too it may be observed that one aspect of the work of Christ was in danger of being overlooked when, in the apocalyptic hymns of triumph, He was said to have *redeemed* us (Rev. v. 9; xiv. 3, 4), where the Greek speaks of a *purchase*, which is far more. We have not only been delivered from the enemy, but we have also been made wholly Christ's: *we are not our own; we were bought with a price* (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20).

6. These vivid traits are often due to the full rendering of an unusual word. Thus we read, Matt. xxi. 44 (Luke xx. 18), *On whomsoever [this stone] shall fall, it will scatter*

him as dust (*λικμήσει*). In St. Mark's narrative of the baptism (i. 10), it is said that Christ saw *the heavens* rent asunder (*σχιζομένους*). The point of the Lord's parable addressed to Simon (Luke vii. 41) is made clearer by the use of the word *lender* (*δανειστής* here only) for *creditor*. Both debtors had received a *loan* (Matt. xviii. 27 marg.). The action of St. Paul at Corinth is seen to be more expressive when we read that *he* shook out *his raiment* (Acts xviii. 6; comp. Matt. x. 14, Mark vi. 11, Acts xiii. 51). And not a few of the unusual words which provoked criticism on the first appearance of the Revision are close renderings of unusual words in the Greek (comp. IV. § 10). However familiar we may have become with the phrase, "tinkling *cymbal*," no one can seriously suppose that it gives the force of St. Paul's words (1 Cor. xiii. 1, *κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον*), which are adequately expressed by "clanging *cymbal*." The phrase, "reverent in demeanour," no doubt contains two words new to the English Version of the New Testament, but the two corresponding words in the original are also unique (Tit. ii. 3, *ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπέις*). Nothing could be more natural than that a critic should condemn the change in the description of the spirit which God has given us as being "*of power and love and discipline*" (2 Tim. i. 7; A.V., *and of a sound mind*), till he realised that the peculiar word used by St. Paul describes not a result, but a process (*σωφρονισμός*; comp. marg. "Gk., *sobering*").

7. For in many cases words were not only inadequately, but also wrongly rendered in A.V. No word perhaps fared worse in this respect than that which represents "gaining," or "winning" (*κτᾶσθαι*). The perfect of this verb is naturally used for "possessing" (equivalent to "having gained"), and this sense was wrongly transferred to the present. So it was that the most inspiring promise by which the Lord crowns endurance with victory, *In your*

*patience* ye shall win *your souls* (Luke xxi. 19, reading *κτήσεσθε* for *κτήσασθε*; comp. Matt. v. 48), was made a mere command to hold what is our own already: *In your patience* possess ye *your souls* (A.V.). The boast of the Pharisee loses its force when he is made to say (Luke xviii. 12): *I give tithes of all that I possess* (A.V.), instead of *of all that I get* (R.V.). It is vital for us to remember that our own bodies also must be won: we must not only "possess them," but "possess ourselves of them" (1 Thess. iv. 4). There is a converse error in the rendering of a unique word in Eph. i. 11. The confidence of Christians is most surely founded in the fact that they were *made a heritage* (R.V. *ἐκληρώθημεν*), and not that they *have obtained an inheritance* (A.V.). God has taken them for His own; that is enough (comp. Tit. ii. 14, R.V.). The very word "testament" itself misrepresents the Divine relation to men. God has been pleased to make a "covenant" with them, a covenant indeed of which He fixes the terms in His own good pleasure (*διαθήκη*, not *συνθήκη*); but still our trust rests on a "covenant" (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25), of which the "covenant" with Israel was the type. The new fellowship thus established between believers, in virtue of their common union with Christ, becomes the sure foundation of a regenerated humanity. The love of man rests on the love of God: love in the widest sense grows out of "love of the brethren" (R.V. *φιλαδελφία*), and not out of an indefinite "brotherly kindness"; and if something is lost in the rhythm of 2 Pet. i. 5-7 in R.V., the loss is compensated a thousandfold by the true representation of that moral growth which answers to the Incarnation.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The student will find the following examples worthy of careful consideration: Matt. iv. 24, xvii. 15, *epileptic* (*σεληνιαζόμενος*, A.V. *lunatic*); Mark vi. 20, *kept him safe* (*συνετήρει*, A.V. *observed him*); vi. 53, *moored to the shore* (*προσωρισθησαν*, A.V. *drew to the shore*); Luke vi. 35, *never despairing* (*μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες*, A.V. *hoping for nothing again*); Acts ii. 6, *when this sound was*



8. Faulty renderings of constructions contributed no less than faulty renderings of words to obscure the clear force of the original language. There is a mysterious pathos of Divine knowledge in the sentence addressed to Judas by the Lord, "Friend, do that for which thou art come" (Matt. xxvi. 50, *ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πᾶρται*), which is wholly lost in the impossible question of A.V., "Wherefore art thou come?" The Greek of Mark v. 30 suggests the thought that the healing energy of the Lord was, as it were, a Divine effluence. This is adequately conveyed by R.V., "perceiving . . . that the power proceeding from Him had gone forth," in place of the vague phrase of A.V., "that virtue had gone out of Him." The power of the false Christs is left undetermined in the Greek and R.V. to "lead astray, if possible, the elect," and not limited as in A.V., "if it were possible" (Mark xiii. 22). The answer of "the boy Jesus" to His mother (Luke ii. 49) becomes perfectly intelligible when it is translated, "*How is it that ye sought Me? wist ye not that I must be in My Father's house?*" He could be in no other place; to look for Him elsewhere was to misunderstand His person and work. The principle of discipleship has a universal application. *The disciple is not above his Master; but every one when he is perfected (not, as A.V. every one that is perfect) shall be as his master* (Luke vi. 40). The progress of character answers to the progress of knowledge. The secret of the difference between Samaritan and Jew lies in the words, *Ye worship that which ye know not (not, as A.V., ye know not what): we*

*heard; xix. 2, whether the Holy Ghost was given (ἐλ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἔστιν, A.V. whether there be any Holy Ghost: comp. John vii. 39); xxiv. 22, I will determine your matter; 1 Pet. ii. 2, spiritual milk (λογικὸν γάλα, A.V. milk of the word); Jude 12, autumn trees without fruit (δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα, A.V. trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit); Rom. viii. 4, ordinance (δικαίωμα, A.V. righteousness); xi. 7, hardened (ἐπωρώθησαν, A.V. blinded; comp. v. 25, 2 Cor. iii. 14, Eph. iv. 18); 1 Thess. v. 22, form of evil; Heb. ii. 16, not of angels doth He take hold (οὐκ ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, A.V. He took not on Him the nature of angels).*

worship that which we know (John iv. 22). Jew and Samaritan alike worshipped the true God, but the Jew alone worshipped Him with that growing intelligence which answered to the later stages of revelation. There is a personal profession in the words of St. Peter, "if ye call on Him as Father" (1 Pet. i. 17), which is lost in A.V., "if ye call on the Father," so that the neglect of the construction mars the force of the argument. Our creed indeed moulds us, "*that form of teaching* whereunto [we] were delivered" (Rom. vi. 17), and not simply "which was delivered [us]" (A.V.). Once again we catch (as it seems) a glimpse of St. Paul's physical infirmity when he writes to the Galatians, *See with how large letters* (not, as A.V., *how large a letter*) *I have written unto you with mine own hand.*<sup>1</sup>

9. In all these cases the English reader must feel that it is a clear gain to be able to catch the fresh vigour of the original language. Other changes, especially in the historical books, present lifelike traces of temporal or local colouring. The following need no illustrative comment :

Matt. xxvi. 25, *Is it I, Rabbi?*

„ xxvii. 15, *The governor was wont to release unto the multitude one prisoner.*

Mark ii. 18, *John's disciples and the Pharisees* were fasting.

„ xiv. 67, *Thou also wast with the Nazarene*, even Jesus (comp. Matt. xxvi. 71 ; Mark xvi. 6).

Luke xxii. 66, *the assembly of the elders of the people*, . . . both chief priests and scribes . . .

John iv. 15, *come all the way hither* (comp. Acts ix. 38).

„ xii. 13, *the branches of the palm trees* (Bethany = house of palms).

John xxi. 12, *Come and break your fast* (comp. v. 4).

Acts viii. 1, *And there arose on that day* . . .

„ xix. 35, *temple-keeper of the great Diana.*

„ xxi. 38, *Art thou not then the Egyptian?* . . .

<sup>1</sup> Compare also Matt. vi. 18 ; Luke iii. 23, xxiii. 15 ; Col. ii. 23 ; Heb. i. 14.

Acts xxiii. 27, *I came upon them with the soldiers.*

„ xxvii. 14, *There beat down from it a tempestuous wind.*

2 Cor. xi. 26, *in perils of rivers.*

One uniform change of this kind, the substitution of *boats* for *ships*, has restored to a right scale the features of the fisherman's life by the Sea of Galilee.

10. In this connexion the technical terms for offices, coins, measures, and the like, received careful attention. But it was found impossible to give simple equivalents for the original terms, and the words which had become familiar in A.V. (*publicans, penny, measure, etc.*) were left unchanged, except in some cases, where the exact rendering is of historical importance; as, for example,

Luke ii. 2, *enrolment* (A.V. *taxing*).

Acts xiii. 7 f, xviii. 12, xix. 38, *proconsul* (A.V. *deputy*).

„ xxi. 38, *the Assassins.*

„ xxii. 28, *citizenship.*

„ xxv. 21, *the emperor* (A.V. *Augustus*).

So also the two meanings of "prætorium" (Mark xv. 16), as the word was respectively understood at Rome and in the provinces, have been rightly distinguished: Phil. i. 13, *the prætorian guard* (A.V. *the palace*); Matt. xxvii. 27 (and parallels), Acts xxiii. 35, *the palace* (A.V. *common hall; judgment hall*, John xviii. 28, etc.). A trace of the popular divisions of the Pentateuch is preserved in the reference to "*the place concerning the Bush*" (Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37).

In some cases a marginal note guides the reader to the special meaning of a wide term (Rev. vi. 6; Acts xvi. 20, 35, 38, xix. 31); and a general note of the American Revisers (XII.) suggests additional information.

11. Of the traces of contemporary knowledge and feeling, none are more interesting than those which note transitory and progressive phases of religious thought. It is, for

example, most significant that in the historical narrative of the Gospels (contrast Matt. i. 1, Mark i. 1, John i. 17) the title Christ does not occur as a proper name, with two most interesting exceptions (*Jesus Christ*, Matt. xvi. 21; John xvii. 3; comp. Matt. i. 18), which we cannot now discuss. Except in these two passages the original term always describes the office, "the Christ," "the Messiah." Thus John "heard in prison the works of the Christ," the works which were characteristic of the Messiah, and not "the works of Christ" simply, that is, the things which Jesus did (Matt. xi. 2; comp. i. 17: see also Mark xii. 35, xiii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 23 marg.). So also the titles, "Jesus the Galilæan," "Jesus the Nazarene" (Matt. xxvi. 69, 71), "the Nazarene" (Mark xiv. 67, xvi. 6), evidently belong to the earliest stage of the gospel.<sup>1</sup>

Another slight trait which might easily be overlooked marks the very early date of the substance of St. Matthew's narrative. Both St. Matthew and St. John quote passages of Scripture as fulfilled at the Passion. In St. Matthew we read (xxvi. 56), "*all this is come to pass (γέγονεν), that . . .*"; in St. John (xix. 36), "*these things came to pass (ἐγένετο), that . . .*" The first phrase took shape while the events were still, so to speak, actually present in the experience of the narrator; the second is the natural language of one writing when the fact had become part of a (relatively) distant history. (Comp. Matt. i. 22; xxi. 4.)

So in the record of the early preaching in the Acts we have a view of the first gospel. The apostles "preached" (not *Jesus Christ*, A.V., but) *Jesus as the Christ* (Acts v. 42; comp. ii. 36).

It is a trait of the same kind that we read in Jas. ii. 2 of the Christian assembly under the Jewish title *synagogue*

<sup>1</sup> It is, I think, to be regretted that the adjective, "the Nazarene," could not be uniformly given for the Greek adjectives (Ναζωραῖος, Ναζαρηνός), as distinguished from the substantive form (ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, John i. 45).

(A.V. *assembly*), which belongs to the first age, though it naturally lingered in the circle of the Palestinian Churches.

12. Two religious titles which are placed in simple distinctness in R.V. deserve particular study, "the Way" and "the Name." The first is characteristic of the Acts (ix. 2; xix. 9, 23; [xxii. 4;] xxiv. 14, 22; comp. xvi. 17; xviii. 25 f), and presents vividly a very early aspect of the Faith. The second has a wider range, and practically expresses the primitive Christian creed (Rom. x. 9 marg.; 1 Cor. xii. 3). It is related in the account of the first persecution that the apostles rejoiced *that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonour for the Name* (Acts v. 41). St. John speaks of faithful teachers who *went forth for the sake of the Name* (3 John 7; see note *ad loc.*). And St. James appears to allude to the title when he speaks of those who *blasphemed the honourable name* by which believers were called (Jas. ii. 7).<sup>1</sup>

13. In this respect the definiteness of the terms used of the second coming of Christ and of the Messianic age, to which reference has been already made (II. § 12), is particularly striking. No one can fail to feel the increased power of the scene in the Apocalypse (vii. 13 f) as it is given in R.V. in close accordance with the Greek: *One of the elders answered, saying unto me, These which are arrayed in the white robes, who are they, and whence came they? And I say unto him, My lord, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which come (οἱ ἐρχόμενοι; A.V. which came) out of the great tribulation (ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης; A.V. out of great tribulation), and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.* Nor is it too much to say that the whole relation of the seen to the unseen, the great parable of life, is illuminated by the correspondence disclosed in the expectation of "the father

<sup>1</sup> Another title of deep interest in Jewish history has been given to the English Version, *the Dispersion*: John vii. 35; Jas. i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 1 (*διασπορά*).



of the faithful": *He looked for the city which hath the foundations* (τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν; A.V. a city which hath foundations), *whose builder and maker is God*, the city of which all earthly organizations are only transitory figures.

14. This view of the world (*the ages, οἱ αἰῶνες*) as a gradual unfolding of the Divine counsel in time is embodied in the contrast between "these days" and "those days," "this age" and "the age to come," the preparatory period and the period of the Messianic kingdom, which runs through the New Testament, though it may in some cases be easily lost sight of. Thus in the singularly pregnant comparison of the Old and New with which the Epistle to the Hebrews opens (Heb. i. 1-4), the writer speaks of the coming of Him who was Son "at the end of these days," at the close, that is, of the preparatory stage of the Divine order. An overhasty critic, who had forgotten the technical sense of "these days," not unnaturally pronounced the phrase "impossible."

These two periods ("this age," "the age to come") were sharply distinguished. But the New was significantly regarded as the child of the Old; and the passage from the one period to the other was habitually presented as a new birth. The sufferings by which it was accompanied were thus shown to be fruitful in final blessing. It is of importance therefore that "travail"—the exact rendering—should be substituted for "sorrows" in Matt. xxiv. 8 (Mark xiii. 8; comp. John xvi. 21 f; Rom. viii. 22).

15. Nearly all the illustrations which have been given hitherto have been taken from exact renderings of the common Greek text; but sometimes the change which gives the lifelike touch is due to an alteration of reading in the original. In such cases the increased vigour of the expression supplies internal evidence of the truth of the most ancient text. Few, for example, will miss the point of the

lesson that we are scholars of our creed: *Every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven* (μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ, for εἰς τὴν βασ., A.V., instructed unto the kingdom . . .) . . . *bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old* (Matt. xiii. 52; comp. § 8). The difficulty in Mark vii. 19 disappears when, adopting the masculine participle, which refers back to v. 18, we read *This He said, making all meats clean*. Several details in the record of the Passion are of considerable interest. The narrative of the feet-washing is placed in its true connexion (John xiii. 2) by the introductory clause, *during supper* (δείπνου γινομένου, A.V. *supper being ended*, δείπ. γενομένου). The action of the multitude is described with an additional trait of lifelike vigour when it is said by St. Mark (xv. 8), that they *went up* (ἀναβάς, A.V. [*cried*] *aloud*, ἀναβοήσας) *and began to ask* [*Pilate*] *to do as he was wont to do unto them*. The mockery of chief priests and scribes is made uniform in its scornful bitterness in the text of St. Matthew: *He saved others*. . . . *He is the King of Israel* (A.V. if He is . . . εἰ βασιλεὺς Ἰ. ἐστίν); *let Him now come down from the cross*. . . . (Matt. xxvii. 42; comp. Luke xxiii. 39, R.V., *Art not Thou the Christ?*) And the prayer of the penitent robber (Luke xxiii. 42) seems to gain an impressive and natural pathos from the use of the Lord's human name: *He said, Jesus, remember me when Thou comest in Thy kingdom* (A.V. *He said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me* . . .).

Two small variations in the records of the Resurrection may also be noticed. The language in which Mary first addressed the risen Lord—the language of familiar intercourse—is noticed in the true text of St. John: *She saith unto Him* in Hebrew, *Rabboni* (John xx. 16). And in the narrative of the walk to Emmaus, as we now read it, the first question of the Lord was followed by a most solemn pause, which seems to bring the incident before our eyes. *He said unto them, What communications are*

these that ye have one with another, as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad (καὶ ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί, Luke xxiv. 17).<sup>1</sup>

16. In not a few places the most ancient text has preserved characteristic traces of primitive aspects of the faith of which the significance was lost in later time. Thus it is of moment that in the *Benedictus* the nativity is spoken of (according to the true reading) in the future (Luke i. 78): *The day-spring from on high* shall visit us (ἐπισκέψεται; A.V. hath visited us, ἐπεσκέψατο). The Samaritans, in natural accordance with their position, speak of the Lord simply as *the Saviour of the world* (John iv. 42; A.V. prefixes *the Christ*). In the brief narrative of the rise of the hostility against Christ at Jerusalem St. John distinguishes two stages, determined by two elements in His teaching (v. 16, 18), which are confused in the later text. It is not again without interest that we find believers spoken of in their first assembly (Acts i. 15) as *brethren* (A.V. *disciples*). And those who follow with reverent care the steps by which the early Church were enabled to realise the fulness of the Lord's Divine Person will feel with what force and, we may say, with what fitness, the record is closed by the statement that St. Paul—the Apostle called by the Lord in glory—*straightway in the synagogues* [at Damascus] *proclaimed* Jesus (A.V. Christ), *that He is the Son of God* (Acts ix. 20).<sup>2</sup>

It is unnecessary to add further illustrations of the manner in which the R.V. has reproduced details which stamp the writings of the New Testament as contemporary records of the Lord and the Apostles. Those which have been given will serve to stimulate and to guide patient in-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Matt. xxv. 6; Mark vi. 20 (ἡπόρει), x. 50 (ἀναπηδήσας), xiii. 14 (ἐστηκότα, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 4); Luke i. 42 (κραίγη), xvii. 33 (περιποιήσασθαι); John iii. 25 (Ἰουδαίον).

<sup>2</sup> Compare Rom. iv. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 47; 1 Pet. iii. 21; Rev. i. 5.

quiry; and their significance extends beyond the immediate field of investigation from which they have been taken. For while some of the variations which we have noticed are in themselves trivial, some are evidently important: but they all represent the action of the same law; they all hang together; they are samples of the general character of the Revision. And, even if we estimate differently the value of the particular differences which they express, we can certainly see that they do express differences; and they are sufficient, I cannot doubt, to encourage the student to consider in any case of change which comes before him whether there may not have been reasons for making it which are not at once clear; whether it may not suggest some shade of thought undefined before; whether, at any rate, it is not more reverent to allow the apostles to speak to us as nearly as possible in the exact form in which they first spoke.

B. F. WESTCOTT.

---

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF  
EDWARD IRVING.

I COME now to the critical stage of Mr. Irving's career, and of my connexion with him. For three years before I saw him his attention had been powerfully drawn to the study of *Prophecy* by Mr. James Hatley Frere, a gentleman of incisive mind and then well known as a writer on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse, specially in connexion with the pre-millennial theory of the Second Advent—a study which some think fitted only to turn people's heads, while others, who find so large a portion of Scripture occupied with it, think themselves not at liberty to neglect it. In Mr. Irving's case, however, there were dangers attending it from his constitutional

tendencies—a rich and surging imagination, never under sufficient control; while the spell of a mysterious future which this study led him to believe was fast approaching, and indeed at the door, laid him open to influences fitted seriously to warp his judgment. But whereto this would grow, who could have foreseen? least of all himself. Its first effect was to give a new and more exact turn to his biblical studies, which till now had dealt only with great generalities. This gradually moulded and modified his whole views both of Christ and of the world, giving rise to scenes in his place of worship which his ecclesiastical superiors felt themselves bound to put a stop to; and this, as might be expected, issued in his severance from the Church of Scotland, but next the formation of a perfectly novel religious body of which he was but the nominal head—it being constructed according to directions given forth by others supposed to be divinely gifted. The unceasing anxieties which this brought on, and the severe exertions he had to undergo in trying to give this movement a footing in the country, at a time when he was ill able to bear them, told fatally on his noble frame, bringing it, alas! to a premature end. And as my connexion with him extended from a time when these events had not even begun to take shape, until the close of his ministry in Regent's Square, my object in the sequel of these Reminiscences shall be to state frankly those occurrences as they came under my own eye, how my own views and actings were affected by them, the time when and the reasons why I was forced to stand in doubt of them, and what at length made it impossible for me any longer to remain with him.

No sooner had Mr. Irving mastered the scheme which in outline he received from Mr. Frere, than he hastened to give voice and volume to it through the press. Instead of first reading what others before him had written on this subject—from which he would have found that for a couple



of centuries Mr. Frere's views in substance had been held and controverted—he regarded that gentleman as the great discoverer, taking in, almost in the lump, whatever he laid down, including some things which no competent judge could fail to reject. To me this was surprising, who for years before that had been led, in my own study of the New Testament, to believe that the pre-millennial theory of the Second Advent was the true one; who had read the works of Joseph Mede, the great master in that line of study, and had even advocated it in a society of my fellow students of theology in my own city.

Mr. Irving's first work on the subject—*Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed of God*—is an astonishing illustration of the folly of rushing into print so ill-furnished as he was on the subject. He there actually endorses Frere's advocacy of the Apocryphal book called *Second Esdras*, as a piece of inspired prophetic Scripture, and as carrying its own evidence—which evidence simply is, that it confirmed his own prophetic theories.<sup>1</sup> On his morning services this new line of study for some time made little impression. At least during the two months of my first stay in London, the only trace of it I could observe was an occasional reference to the Second Coming of Christ as pre-millennial—which rather drew me to him. But later in that year he preached before the Continental Society a sermon in which he launched out into great detail on this subject, representing “the last times”—the very crisis of European Christendom, and the Second Coming of Christ—as already at the door. In fact, the heated style in which that sermon closes reads painfully as if his mind had been getting off its balance.<sup>2</sup> Near the end of it he announced that he would “open these

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Westcott's article, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, on this worthless production will satisfy any one who reads it of the folly of regarding it as inspired Scripture.

<sup>2</sup> It will be found in *Sermons*, etc., vol. iii. (1828).

mysteries in many discourses every Sabbath evening in that church where the Lord required him to be a watchman." This soon thinned his evening audience; for long experience has shewn that there is no surer way of emptying a church—even where the preacher is eloquent on other topics—than going into minute biblical details on such subjects. To add to this mistake, since he was now becoming more expository even in his morning discourses—which of course afforded less scope for that splendid oratory that had crowded his Caledonian chapel—his popularity even in the morning was not now what it had been.

The students of Prophecy (as they were called) now began to attract attention. They embraced a number of English clergy of social standing, and private gentlemen of wealth and intelligence, such as the Hon. and Rev. Gerard Noel, the Rev. (afterwards) Dr. Hugh McNeile, the wealthy Rev. Lewis Way, Henry Drummond, the rich and eccentric banker, Joseph Wolff (the converted Jew, whose wife, Lady Georgiana Wolff, was the mother of our statesman, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff), and Irving, to whom they all looked up as their chief and their public expositor. At Albury Park, Guildford, Mr. Drummond's splendid country residence, this body held Conferences for some years in succession on prophetic subjects, and were for a week at a time hospitably entertained (as I can testify, having been once at least with them). For about seven hours a day they held friendly discussion, in morning and evening sessions; but how ill-furnished they were with any sound principles of biblical interpretation it was easy for me to see. Once Mr. Irving told me—almost with bated breath—what made me afraid even for himself. At one of these Conferences they came upon what were the Notes of a true Church; and as one "Note" after another was enunciated and accepted, one of the party—"a weak man," said Irving

—began to think he was in the wrong Church, and on leaving said to himself, If these are the Notes of a true Church, I should be in the Church of Rome, where alone such marks are to be found. And into the Church of Rome went this—one of some note at the time.

Mr. Irving's prophetic studies were like the rolling snow-ball, gathering bulk and strength the deeper he plunged into the subject; insomuch that, though as early as the year 1828 he was alleged to be broaching deadly heresy on the Human Nature of our Lord—of which more hereafter—it seemed never to trouble him; Prophecy, and the prospects it opened to him, carrying him away into the near future, while the difficulties he was creating for himself in the present sat lightly upon him. In the month of May of that year, his wife being in Scotland, he determined to join her in order to avail himself of a month, proverbially a red-letter one in Scotland, for gathering into the metropolis ministers, elders, and others to the annual meeting of the General Assembly, in order to lay before them those prophetic views which with him were "the question of the hour." Taking in his way the scenes of his early days at Annan and Dumfries, he preached to immense crowds on his one theme. As soon as he got to Edinburgh he announced twelve Lectures on the Apocalypse, to be delivered in St. Andrew's Church at six o'clock in the morning, in order to leave the day clear for Assembly business. Ludicrous as that hour would have been in any other case, the church was packed long before it. Even Dr. Chalmers and his party could not get in, and they had to adjourn to the "West Kirk," "the largest church (wrote Chalmers) in our metropolis," but "each time crowded." What however did Chalmers find in the Lectures? "Power and riches and gleams of beauty, but they were quite woeful." Returning to London, he published, in July of that year, a thick volume entitled *The Last Days*, a discourse on the

evil character of these our times, proving them to be the "perilous times" of the "last days." The eloquence of these discourses, preached to his own flock, has been much extolled, and the volume was republished a good many years ago; but, though then sympathizing with their general scope, they seemed to me full of exaggerated denunciation of evils seldom absent from great cities, and even at that time not peculiarly rife. Even then it was plain to me that the whole was a foregone conclusion—that having convinced himself that the "last days" of his text had already come, he behoved to find them in a demoralized and dissolved state of society everywhere.

But this brings me to the time when, as his assistant, I was able to note every step in his progress, till we had to bid each other a sorrowful farewell. And here I must begin with the General Assembly, 1831, which was memorable for three things. It deposed that saintly man, the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, minister of the parish of Row, Dumbartonshire, for teaching the doctrine of "Universal Pardon"; it deprived of his license as a preacher of the Gospel Mr. A. J. Scott, who, in presence of that Assembly, declared that he could no longer subscribe to the Confession of Faith on the "Extent of the Atonement"; and it did the same to the Rev. Hugh Baillie MacLean, Licentiate of the Presbytery of Irvine, Ayrshire, but ordained by the Presbytery of London over the congregation of London Wall. He had got a presentation to the parish of Dreghorn, also in Ayrshire, and accepted it, but was served with a Libel charging him with teaching "The Sinfulness of Christ's Human Nature"—which charge was found proven, first by the Presbytery, next by the Synod, and lastly by the General Assembly.

In none of these cases was Mr. Irving personally involved; but so close and tender was his attachment to the two former gentlemen, and such his general sympathy with

their teaching, that their condemnation came upon him like a blow struck at himself; while the condemnation of his own views in the person of his disciple, Mr. MacLean, was a clear forecast of what would eventually be his own fate. It is the last of these cases which alone I have here to do with; but the first of them (and even the second) involves so much that to Scottish readers at least is full of significance, that I hope elsewhere to be able to throw some light upon them.<sup>1</sup> The last case, that of Mr. MacLean, I approach with something of the feeling of Æneas, when queen Dido asked him to relate to her the tale of Troy—

“Infandum, regina, jubes renovare dolorem.”

As early as when I first met with Mr. Irving, he had been meditating a course of sermons on the *Incarnation*, and had got deep in it towards the end of 1827, when a stranger stepping in one evening heard what shocked him about Christ's human nature. On asking an explanation in the vestry, and receiving it, instead of calling, as invited, on the preacher for fuller explanation (day and hour being named), he went straight with it to the public press. On learning this, Mr. Irving, who by this time was preparing his discourses for publication, determined to recast them in a more formal style.<sup>2</sup> Until late in 1830 I never saw those sermons; and as his whole preaching convinced me that to him at least our Lord was absolutely spotless and very

<sup>1</sup> Even here I may say, (1) that after studying Mr. Campbell's writings, as well as hearing him preach once and again, I believe that, before his deposition at least, he did not teach that any man was actually pardoned until he believed; but (2) since the phrase “universal pardon,” which he persisted in retaining, undoubtedly expressed the reverse of this, the Church could not allow him to use it; yet (3) to declare him no longer a minister of the Church of Scotland would have sufficed to free her from all responsibility for his teaching, while the pain of deposing such a man, so trying to many who had no sympathy with his style of teaching, would have been avoided. It is due however to those who most reluctantly voted for that step, to add that they only did so on being informed that by no other step could he be legally separated from his living.

<sup>2</sup> They occupy the whole of vol. i. of *Sermons*, etc. (1828).



dear, while my own duties were engrossing, I let the whole subject alone until the publication of his pamphlet entitled *The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature*, which was filling all Scotland with alarm, forced me to go into it. With what impressions I first read that pamphlet I cannot now recall. Perhaps the feeling was a mixed one. I had not the self-reliance of my predecessor, Mr. A. J. Scott, who had only too much of it; and I suppose I was neither prepared to challenge his views, nor, on the other hand, to concede what might have to be retracted.

His whole case is briefly expressed by himself in the very first sentence of his preface to this pamphlet: "When I attribute sinful properties, dispositions, and inclinations to our Lord's human nature, I am speaking of it apart from Him, in itself; I am defining the qualities of that *nature* [his own italics] which He took upon Him, and demonstrating it to be the very same in substance with that which we possess." The confusion here is too obvious to need pointing out; but what is surprising is, that he confesses he had never inquired what constitutes *personality* during all the time he was writing that big book on the Incarnation, nor until he had written the first part of this tract. His idea seems to be, that since Christ, when He assumed a human *nature*, did not become a human *person* (as Nestorius is *said* to have held, for only extracts from his writings were preserved by the orthodox), therefore we may ascribe sinfulness to His human *nature* without implicating *Himself* in it. But to every one not involved in some psychological maze, it must be obvious that the word "inclinations" (or "dispositions") has no meaning at all if not those of a person—whether it be Christ Himself or one of ourselves. In the person of Mr. MacLean, the General Assembly of 1831 could do nothing less than deprive him of his license to preach such doctrine.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As I was present during the whole trial, the following particulars may

One more stage of these Reminiscences will bring them to what proved the beginning of the end of Mr. Irving's

interest Scottish readers. Mr. (afterwards Lord) Cockburn, after examining the papers, agreed to be his counsel if he would consent to answer no questions without his leave. But we, who knew the man's soft nature and ignorance of the world, with his impression that he had a grand testimony to bear on that occasion, were pretty sure he would break down here. The House was choke full, and was in breathless silence while one question after another was put to draw him out—Cockburn meanwhile, with his hand pressed close to his mouth and nudging him, trying to keep him silent as his only chance of escape. At length, getting fairly entrapped, he came out with an admission which sent a thrill of horror through the House; and Cockburn, seeing what would follow, whispered in my hearing (for I was close by), "The big idiot!"

\* \* The only sect, to my knowledge, that was ever known to hold the "sinfulness of Christ's Human Nature" with the "holiness of His Person" is that of *Madame Antonia Bourignon*—born at Lisle (Flanders) 1616, died 1680: a lady abnormally formed from birth, and as she grew up showing unnatural cerebral activity, pouring forth a farrago of wild religious opinions, under supposed Divine inspiration, first orally and then in writing. (Her French works fill nineteen thick 12mo volumes.) Strange to say, these incoherent tenets (including the above one of Mr. Irving's) found their way into Scotland, and were embraced, entire, by an Aberdeen Doctor of Divinity of the name of Garden (or Gairden, as spelt in the books of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, kindly shewn me). This gentleman published *An Apology for M. Antonia Bourignon*, but had it printed anonymously in London, 1699. When asked by the Commission of the General Assembly, 1700, if he was the author of that book, he declined to answer, but defended its contents as fitted to promote the cause of religion; and failing to appear when cited before the General Assembly, 1701, he was then deposed. The Act containing the sentence of deposition charges him with eight blasphemous tenets, the seventh of which is thus expressed: "The assertion of the sinful corruption of Christ's human nature and a rebellion in Christ's natural will to the will of God." Even for years this system held its ground in Scotland; so that in 1709, among the Acts of Assembly we read that, "understanding the dangerous errors of Bourignonism, already condemned by this Church, do notwithstanding abound in some places of this nation, the Assembly does therefore earnestly recommend to Presbyteries to use all effectual means to prevent the spreading," etc. Again in 1710, "The General Assembly, finding by instruction from several Presbyteries to their commissioners that the gross heresies and errors under the name of Bourignonism are greatly prevailing in the bounds of several synods in this National Church, they, as a remedy against the same, do appoint all ministers in whose parishes the foresaid errors do abound to preach most particularly and faithfully against the same," etc. Finally, in the Assembly 1711, among the questions then prescribed to be put henceforth to men at their ordination is this one:—*3tio*. "Do you disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, *Bourignon*, and other doctrines, contrary to," etc. (In the Free Church, however, when the formula had to be revised, the name of this antiquated system of opinions was supplanted by one more suited to its circumstances.)

career. Even before I joined him, Mr. A. J. Scott had once and again expressed to him his conviction that there was nothing to prevent those "gifts of the Spirit" which were possessed and so exuberantly exercised in the Church of Corinth from reappearing even now, provided there were faith enough to ask and be prepared to receive them; for there was no evidence that they had ever been withdrawn, except their actual cessation. A small tract by Mr. Scott on I Corinthians xiv., entitled *Charismata*, was intended to enforce this opinion. Irving, always ready to listen to Scott, would naturally conclude that it had an important bearing on the great events which he was expecting. For some time it did not appear to have taken strong hold of his mind, though once and again in the course of his expositions he expressed his conviction that these gifts were still the heritage of the Church. I have a faint recollection of his questioning me on the subject, but of my answer I can remember only this, that I also could see no clear evidence that those "gifts" were intended only to give a start to Christianity in apostolic times. With Mr. Irving, I expected the Second Advent to be pre-millennial, but not so near at hand as he did; at the same time, if he were right, Christendom, then ill prepared for it, would need to be roused by other means than then appeared; and who could say that this might not be one of the ways of reaching the ear even of the deaf?

Events in the west of Scotland soon brought this question to the front. The beautiful memoir by Mr. Story of Roseneath of Isabella Campbell, a parishioner of his and a saintly girl, had spread so rapidly and attracted so much attention, that crowds of people came to the little cottage where she had lived and died, to see her sister, there spoken much of. This Mary Campbell was a person of attractive appearance and very clever, but very excitable. Engaged to a young man with whom she was to have gone abroad

on a mission to the heathen, the desire to carry out this object, even after his death, remained with her; and at length, through a growing persuasion of the power of believing prayer to heal the sick and bring back the other "gifts of the Spirit," it was given out that Mary Campbell had "the gift of tongues," and that it was the language of some far-off tribe to whom the Gospel was thereby to be preached. For the whole facts of this remarkable case—which Mr. Story watched, at every stage of it with unprejudiced mind, until he had indisputable evidence that it was a delusion—I must refer the reader who has any interest in the subject to the Rev. Dr. (now Professor) Story's admirably written and valuable memoir of his father,<sup>1</sup> whose acquaintance it was my happiness to enjoy while assistant for more than a year to the parish minister of Dumbarton. But the facts there detailed were then quite unknown to me; and beyond faint rumours of strange goings-on at Roseneath and Port Glasgow I knew nothing. What I now most wonder at is, that while Mr. Story had vainly tried to disabuse Mr. Irving's mind of his belief that hers was a genuine work of God, he never came upon the case with me.

For two weeks before and during the General Assembly, 1831, when his own case was virtually to be tried in the person of Mr. MacLean, morning prayer-meetings were held in his church on the subject; and as they had proved so refreshing and reassuring, they were henceforth continued, even till Mr. Irving's severance from that place of worship. They were held for an hour every morning, from 6.30 to 7.30; and as they were now devoted to prayer for the outpouring of the Spirit, with special reference to the expected restoration of the apostolic "gifts," they were largely attended, and by many outside his own flock. Mr. Irving himself always presided, or, if absent at any time, I did.

<sup>1</sup> Macmillan, 1862.

“Our morning worship,” wrote Mr. Irving of it as late as the beginning of November to an Edinburgh friend, “is attended by nearly 1,000 persons, and the order of it is beautiful. I seek the blessing of God, then we sing, Mr. Brown or I read a chapter, and the Spirit confirming our interpretation one adds and exhorts in few words,” etc.

As time went on, a select number of us would go to breakfast with Mr. and Mrs. Irving, who lived hard by. At one of these breakfasts a sweet, modest young lady, Miss Emily Cardale, began to breathe heavily, and increasingly so, until at length she burst out into loud but abrupt short sentences in English, which after a few minutes ceased. The voice was certainly beyond her natural strength, and the subject matter of it was the expected power of the Spirit, not to be resisted by any who would hear. Mr. Irving asked us to unite in thanksgiving for this answer to our prayers. My own attitude at the moment was a waiting one. It *might* be what was sought, but of more I could have no certainty. Other such utterances followed, but as yet all in private, first by the same voice, but afterwards by a Miss Hall, and then by a man who rather repelled me (a teacher of the name of Taplin), who professed to speak in an unknown tongue. In fact all that was uttered in English seemed to me so poor, and the same thing over again, that I was kept in uneasy suspense; and the only thing that might seem to indicate a “power not their own,” as its source was the unnatural—I could not say preternatural—strength of it.<sup>1</sup> But Mr. Irving was now brought to a stand. “Am I at liberty to confine the Spirit’s voice to private gatherings, never letting it be heard in ‘the great congregation’?” If once heard

<sup>1</sup> A German teacher, when contrasting in my presence what of it he himself had heard with the majesty and the weight of the Bible oracles, said in his broken English, “Will anybody *comment* you?” (think it worth while to write a commentary on such pointless effusions.)



there, he knew well enough the trouble it would bring him into ; but the die was cast. " I cannot hinder it." At the prayer-meetings, and at length from the pulpit, he let his determination be known, which when noised abroad drew, as might be expected, crowds to Regent's Square Church. Miss Hall was the first whose voice was heard (it was Communion Sunday) ; but, alarmed apparently at what she had done, she rushed to the vestry, near which she was sitting. Mr. Irving, seeing the stir which this created, addressed the audience calmly, and referring to the scenes which occurred in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. xiv.), of which this was but a repetition, dismissed the congregation.

In Mrs. Oliphant's account of what took place there is some confusion, unavoidable with the materials she possessed. But happily she has given Mr. Irving's own account of it, which I am able to supplement, as it refers to myself. It had been arranged that I should preach in the evening ; but the church being packed to the ceiling (in consequence of the scene of the morning), he offered to take the service himself. Several things however had combined to brace me up to it, and I declined. That God had some great purpose to unfold in connection with coming events I could not but think ; and as all London was then astir about the cholera, for the first time coming to our shores and even at the door, I had prepared myself to preach upon the 91st Psalm, whose assurances, vividly realized, would be the best preservative against fear, to which nature itself would lend strength. Another thing was engrossing me, to which I was determined to give voice in the lesson I had selected for the evening. This was a remarkable utterance in this " power " of a very different speaker from any yet heard—Mr. Robert Baxter, a solicitor, then of Doncaster, but afterwards of high professional standing in London—that " the messengers of the Lord should go forth publishing to the ends of the earth, in the mighty power of

God, the testimony of the near coming of the Lord Jesus.”<sup>1</sup> Is there then to be any new way of giving to the Divine message a prophetic power which it certainly has not now? With this thought weighing on my spirit I read from the pulpit Isaiah xxii., and in a running commentary on the desperate shifts resorted to by godless counsellors when the capital was invested by Sennacherib’s army, I indicated how a similar change of public guides, ecclesiastical as well as civil, to those in Isaiah’s time, might possibly be seen in our day. “*The spiritual ministry! the spiritual ministry!*” was the cry at this stage of a male voice not far from the pulpit. It was Mr. Baxter’s. After a momentary pause I went on as if nothing had happened, though before closing the service was twice slightly interrupted by a voice from one of the female speakers. Mr. Irving, however, sitting below me, was able to quiet the audience. When he and I met in the vestry, he shook me by the hand, and said, “Well, you do have the instinct of expounding.” The sermon, however, seems to have been what struck him, for he wrote the very next day to our mutual Edinburgh friend, Mr. Matthew Norman Macdonald—father, if I mistake not, of our present Lord Advocate—in the following terms (the letter I take from Mrs. Oliphant’s *Life*, vol. ii., pp. 203, 204):—

“London, 7th Nov., 1831. My dear friend, yesterday was our Communion, and the Lord gave me great increase to my Church, nearly a hundred during the half-year; but some have drawn back, offended in the word of the Spirit, in the mouth of the prophets, which, in obedience to the Lord’s Commandment, I have permitted ‘when the Church is gathered together into one place’ on all occasions. Now it is remarked that in all instances the Spirit hath permitted the service to be concluded and the blessing pronounced before the manifestations. [Mr. Irving’s memory, I suspect, is here at fault]. . . . David Brown preached a mighty sermon on the 91st Psalm, bearing

<sup>1</sup> *Narrative of Facts characterizing the Manifestations*, etc., p. 5. (Nisbet, 1833.)

much allusion to the cholera; and twice did the Spirit break forth, once in confirmation generally, that it [the cholera] was the judgment of God, once in particular to the scoffers. I was seated in the great chair, and was enabled by my single voice to preserve order among, I dare say, 3,000 people, and to exhort them, as Peter did at Pentecost, and to commend them to the Lord, and they departed in peace," etc.

Soon, however, the face of the whole thing was changed. Some of Mr. Baxter's utterances on public affairs were fitted to stagger his best friends, while his movements—believed by himself to have been Divinely directed—staggered even himself by the failure of their predicted effects. The impression of all this upon me may be conceived. Never fully convinced that there was anything Divine in these movements, yet prepared to bow to decisive evidence either way, I had watched with painful anxiety every movement in the case; and when some unpleasant things came to my knowledge about one of the parties, fatal to any Divine source in *her* utterances, I was brought by degrees to an immovable conviction that, however these "manifestations" were to be explained, there was nothing supernatural and Divine in them. And as soon as this conviction was reached I felt it to be my imperative duty to make it known to Mr. Irving. But as the day for his appearance before his Presbytery—on a charge from the trustees of his church that he was allowing the public services of religion to be interrupted in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Trust Deed and to the disturbance of the worshippers—had all but arrived, I determined to lay the matter first before Mrs. Irving, who had ever treated me with much respect, whose prudence I admired, and in whose judgment I confided. I stated quietly how slowly and reluctantly my final conviction had been reached, and while hinting at the grounds of it I laid stress on what was to me incredible in Mr. Baxter's claims. And as I deeply felt for her husband's position, who *the very*

*next day* was to stand forth expressing his full belief in the Divine source of these manifestations, I left it with her to break the matter to him, when and how she thought best—though suggesting the propriety of delaying it till after next day. In this she concurred, and we parted affectionately on both sides.

Next morning the usual prayer-meeting was largely attended, Mr. Irving and I present—he deeply solemnized but calm, and I the same though with very different feelings. The select few of us came home with him to breakfast, in the midst of which Miss Cardale uttered, in the usual unnatural voice, some words of cheer in prospect of the day's proceedings. But scarcely had she ceased when a ring came to the door, and Mr. Irving was requested to speak with the stranger. After five minutes' absence he returned, saying, "Let us pray"; and kneeling down all followed, while he spoke in this strain: "Have mercy, Lord, on thy dear servant, who has come up to tell us that he has been deceived, that his word has never been from above but from beneath, and that it is all a lie. Have mercy on him, Lord: the enemy has prevailed against him, and hither he has come in this time of trouble and rebuke and blasphemy, to break the power of the testimony we have to bear this day to this work of Thine. But let Thy work and power appear unto Thy poor servant," etc., etc. On rising, Mrs. Irving and I cast a glance at each other—I, with a strange feeling of wonder at this confirmation from the man's own mouth of what I had said of his utterances and movements not many hours before to her, while she, stunned, no doubt, would nevertheless cling to the belief that her husband's confidence would still vindicate itself. Mr. Baxter, it seems, had come up from Doncaster expressly to tell Mr. Irving what he was now convinced of, and having delivered his message he went straight back. For myself, I went home to make

arrangements for the termination of my engagement with Mr. Irving. The trial proceeded on the 26th and 27th of April, and was concluded on the 2nd of May, 1832, by the judicial removal of Mr. Irving from the National Scotch Church, Regent's Square.

From that day I remained in my lodgings, in daily expectation of a call from Mr. Irving—not feeling it to be my part to intrude upon him, who from his wife had doubtless been put in possession of my whole mind. At length he called, and after being seated, and a long pause—each appearing to expect the other to break silence—he rose up, and said, “Well, Mr. Brown, you have left us.” “Yes, Mr. Irving, I have; but not, as you know, while there was in my mind any shadow of ground to think that this work was Divine. But when that was gone, I had no option.” After a momentary pause, as if to think whether he would enter on the subject with me or break off at once, he said, with a good deal of suppressed feeling, “Your intellect, sir, has destroyed you.” “Yes, sir, I confess it; my intellect *has* done the deed, whatever that may mean; I am responsible for the use of my intellect, and I have used it.” With his hand held to mine and mine warmly grasping his, he left me—my feelings very acute, and his I am sure the same. And thus ended my connexion with this grand man, whose name can never be uttered in my hearing without a feeling of mingled reverence and love arising within me.

DAVID BROWN.



OF SCRIPTURE TERMS USED TO EXPRESS  
 "ETERNITY," WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE  
 TO FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

A FEW years ago I published three *Letters on Future Punishment*. In the argument I called attention to the fact that each of the three forms of words used to describe the eternity of God, of the worship paid to Him, and of the blessedness of the righteous, is applied also to describe the eternity of the state of those who die in sin and unbelief. These forms are three: (a) Some form of the singular of *αἰών*—*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, for ever, for evermore; used of God (2 Cor. ix. 9), of Christ (John viii. 35), of the redeemed (John vi. 51, 58), and of the wicked (Jude 13). The following variants are also found: *εἰς αἰῶνα* (2 Pet. ii. 17), *εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος* (2 Pet. iii. 18), *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος* (Heb. i. 8, for ever and ever). (b) Some form of the plural—*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, for ever, for evermore, for ever and ever; used of God and Christ (Rom. i. 25, 1 Pet. v. 11, 2 Cor. xi. 31), of the saved (Luke i. 33, Rev. xxii. 5), and of the wicked (Rev. xix. 3, xx. 10). Variants are: *τῶν αἰώνων*, eternal (1 Tim. i. 17), *εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας*; used of God (Jude 25), *εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων* (Rev. xiv. 11), *τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων* (Eph. iii. 21, world without end). And (c) *αἰώνιος*, always rendered *eternal* or *everlasting*: used of the eternal God (Rom. xvi. 26), and of the eternal Spirit or of Christ (Heb. ix. 14); of the eternal inheritance, the eternal life, the eternal glory, the eternal kingdom which the eternal gospel gives (Heb. ix. 15, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 10, 1 Pet. v. 10, 2 Pet. i. 11, Rev. xiv. 6); and of the eternal judgment, the eternal punishment, the eternal fire, the eternal destruction of the wicked (Heb. vi. 2, Matt. xxv. 46, 41, 2 Thess. i. 9).

The second of these phrases (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*) is found apparently only in the New Testament, though there

is a similar phrase, in the singular, in the Old. In the Epistles it occurs seven times in doxologies addressed to God. In Revelation it occurs fourteen times, and is applied to God and to Christ, to the saints, and to the state of the wicked. It is the only form of *αἰών* found in that book.

Of these phrases, (a) and (b) are used of future time fifty-seven times, and in every case they are all three used of God and of the righteous and of the punishment of the wicked. The third phrase (c) is used of future time sixty-eight times, and is applied in the New Testament to God, to the blessedness of the saved, and to the punishment of the wicked; and to nothing else. Matthew, Mark, John (in his Gospel, Epistles, and Revelation), Peter, Jude, and Paul, all use one or more of these phrases, and apply them to one or more of the three things I have named, and to nothing else. Not unfrequently the phrases are used in the same context to describe "eternal consolation" and "eternal destruction," "eternal life" and "eternal condemnation," "darkness for ever," and "reigning for ever." There is no diversity of meaning in these phrases in the New Testament, and no such looseness or indefiniteness of usage as some have supposed.

It may, no doubt, be asked whether these expressions, which differ in intensity, differ also in meaning—in extent of duration. Does *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* imply a shorter "everness" than *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*? I think not. The Authorized Version translates the singular *for evermore* (Heb. vii. 28) as well as *for ever*, and it is frequently applied to God and to Christ. The plural it translates *for ever*, *for ever and ever*, *for evermore*. And both singular and plural are applied in the same context to the godly (Luke i. 33, 55). The fact is, that in common life the phrase *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, like the simpler form *ἀεὶ*, and like the English phrase "for ever," came to have a lighter meaning, though there is no certain instance of that meaning in the New Testament. Hence

arose the more emphatic expressions found in English and in Greek. *Evermore*, in truth, is of no longer duration than *for ever* in its proper sense. So the English translators thought, using each form for singular or plural. In *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, the "everness" is regarded as one and indivisible; in *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* (for ever and ever), the "everness" is regarded as made up of "evernesses," which together form the "everness" proper.<sup>1</sup> I may add however that translators should mark uniformly the three different Greek expressions, which correspond, in fact, to our own. *For ever*, *for evermore*, *for ever and ever*, represent exactly different Greek forms, and ought to have been used accordingly in the English versions, though not on the ground that they represent different degrees of duration.

In the *Letters* I state that I deal with *New Testament* usage alone. Twice however I generalize, and affirm that the above phrases are the only phrases in *Scripture* used to describe the future duration of the worship, etc., paid to God, of the blessedness of the righteous, and of the punishment of the wicked. In Canon Farrar's volume on *Mercy and Judgment* he questions, and even denies, this last statement with sadness and surprise. He asks whether I have not read passages in the LXX. where stronger expressions are used of God and salvation than are used of the punishment of the wicked. He also gives a number of expressions in the New Testament or elsewhere which he thinks are stronger than these, and are not applied to the state of the wicked. I do not complain of this appeal, though perhaps one or two phrases used might have been spared. The question is simply a question of fact, and our judgment should follow the evidence. This evidence I proceed to supply. I will give first the Hebrew phrases for eternity used in the Hebrew Scriptures; then the renderings of the LXX. and of the English version, with specimen passages

<sup>1</sup> See Thayer's edition of *Grimm and Wilke's Dictionary*, sub voce.

where each expression is applied to the duration of the praise, etc., offered to God, of the blessedness bestowed on righteousness, and of the punishment of the wicked. As the quotations are taken, for convenience, from the Authorized Version, allowance must be made for well-known variations of psalm or verse when comparing them with the Hebrew and the Septuagint.

I.  $\text{עַד}$  (?), *perpetuity, to the end.* εἰς τέλος, etc.

Ps. xvi. 11, "pleasures for evermore"—applied to the happiness of the righteous. So Ps. xlix. 19, "never": LXX. ἕως αἰῶνος; Heb.  $\text{עַד עַד}$ .

Job xx. 7, "he shall perish for ever"—of the wicked.

Isa. xxxiii. 20, "for ever," εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, describing the security of Jerusalem.

Isa. xxxiv. 10, "for ever and ever" ( $\text{עַד עַד עַד עַד}$ ), "to the very last," a strong form, generally rendered εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον; here very feebly and exceptionally, εἰς χρόνον πολύν—applied to the punishment of the wicked.

II.  $\text{עַד}$  (?), *duration, futurity, eternity (sing.).*: and  $\text{עַד עַד}$ , *durations of duration (pl.).*

Ps. lxi. 8, "for ever," εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, or εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος (Ps. xxi. 6), of praise offered to God (*sing.*).

Ps. xxii. 26, "for ever," εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, of the blessedness of the righteous (*sing.*).

Ps. exxxii. 12, 14, "for evermore," "for ever," ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος, εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος—of God (*pl.*).

Isa. xxvi. 4, "for ever"—of believers (*pl.*).

Ps. xcii. 7, "destroyed for ever," εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, of the punishment of the wicked (*pl.*).

Ps. lxxxiii. 17, "let them be troubled for ever," εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος—of the wicked (*pl.*).

III.  $\text{עוֹלָם}$ , and with  $\text{עַד}$  prefixed, *perpetuity, etc.* ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος, ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος, αἰῶνιος, "for ever"—used nearly three hundred times of God and the righteous, and some thirty times of the punishment of the wicked. Other less usual renderings are ἕως αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων (Dan. vii. 18), εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (for the *sing.*, Mic. iv. 7) as εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is used for the plural.  $\text{עוֹלָם}$ , the nom., is also translated by αἰῶνιος, the adj., and is applied to "everlasting life" as well as to "everlasting contempt" (Dan. xii. 2).

IV. Other combinations are found, especially with  $\text{עַד}$ :  $\text{עוֹלָם עוֹלָם}$

עַד, עַד וְעַד, עוֹלָם, עוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם. These are generally rendered (more than twenty times) *eis aióna aiónos*, or *eis τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*, or *eis τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ eis τὸν αἰῶνα τὸν αἰῶνος*.

Rare and exceptional modes of rendering—attempts to bring out the fulness of the expression—are the following:

*Eis τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα* ("beyond," Mic. iv. 5), "for ever and ever."

"*Εως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἔτι*, Isa. xlv. 17, "world without end."

*Eis τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι*, in Dan. xii. 3, "for ever and ever," and in Exod. xv. 18 (with *ἐπί*

instead of *eis*), "for ever and ever."

The phrase is used of God and of the righteous. It is also used of the wicked, *olam va-ad*, in Ps. ix. 5, "for ever and ever," though there the LXX. translates the phrase *eis τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ eis τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*.

*Ἐπι* itself is used in connexion with the punishment of the wicked in Rev. xviii. 22-24, as it is of the righteous in Rev. vii. 16; and with *οὐ* and *μή*, and is rendered "no more at all."

So with a neg. in Ps. cxlix. 19, "never." LXX. *ἕως αἰῶνος*; Heb. *עַד עַד*.

Two or three facts need to be noted in connexion with this list.

1. Various as the Hebrew expressions are—some fifteen combinations—they are all expressed by forms and combinations of *aión*, and rarely is any other form used. In some five hundred passages *aión* is used to translate the many combinations of the Hebrew words; and though in a dozen places or so *eis τέλος* is used, and in four or five places *ἔτι*, the general rendering of all these forms is *aión*, while the variants *ἔτι* and *eis τέλος* are used of punishment as well as of reward. In the Old Testament *aión* is occasionally used, as *עוֹלָם* is, of a temporary "everness"; but in by far the great majority of cases it has its full meaning, and in the New Testament, when applied to future time, it has no other meaning, unless the phrase "eternal punishment" is an exception. The phrases *ἀεί, ἐς ἀεί, πάντοτε*, (*eis τὸ διηνεκές, παντελές*, which Canon Farrar suggests would have been decisive, are never used in the



Old Testament to express eternity, either of God or of the righteous ; nor are they used (as we shall see) for that purpose in the New.

2. It seems clear that the Greek words of the LXX. were used like the Hebrew words, and like our own *for ever* and *for ever and for ever*, not because the simple form did not mean "for ever," but because "for ever" was sometimes applied in those languages, as in our own, to express the continuity of a temporary "everness," and it was deemed important to guard against this meaning. The various forms were in fact interchangeable, as they are in the English Scriptures. עַד, for example, may mean eternity, and is applied to God (Isa. lvii. 15) ; but it may mean also continuousness, like the *dictator perpetuus* of the Romans ; and hence it is translated sometimes by the plural εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (Ps. lxi. 8). עַד עַד, again, the plural, is translated by the singular (Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14). עוֹלָם, the sing., is translated by εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (Ps. lxxxv. 5, civ. 31 ; Dan. iv. 31), and עוֹלָמִים by the singular (Isa. li. 9, Dan. v. 10). Even the phrase עַד, appended to other words, which Canon Farrar deems so remarkable, and is translated four times by ἔτι or ἐπέκεινα, is generally translated by combinations of αἰών only, and by combinations less strong than the τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων of the New Testament. This inconsistency of rendering, where the meaning is undoubted, shows that in Greek, as in English, "ever," "evermore," "ever and ever," each expressed proper "everness" of duration.

I now come to consider some particular words which, it is said, would be decisive if Scripture used them ; and as Scripture does not use them of future punishment, the duration of it is either simply indefinite or is not revealed.

"There are two very simple adverbs in the New Testament," says Canon Farrar, "either of which would have been regarded as decisive." One is αἰεί, the other πάντοτε ;

each, he adds, is used eight times, but not once of future punishment.

"The glory of Christ lasts to 'all the ages' (*εἰς πάντα τοὺς αἰῶνας*). That phrase would have been regarded as decisive; so would various combinations of *οὐδέ* or *ἐς αἰεί* and *ἄνευ τέλους*. *Εἰς τὸ παντελές* is a strong phrase, and occurs *once*; and *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* is a strong phrase, and occurs *twice*. Why is neither used of future punishment? Why is not the stronger and clearer word *αἰδιος* used? And how is it that an adjective is employed which is far more frequently used of things not endless but terminable?" Such are the statements and questions of Canon Farrar.

These seem grave objections. But they are easily answered. In fact, the details and the principles are alike wanting in accuracy.

It will be conceded that the eternity of God and of the blessedness of the righteous is revealed and described in the Old Testament—of God certainly, and the eternal blessedness of the righteous probably; while in the New Testament both are clearly revealed. And yet, with one or two exceptions, none of the words which it is said would have made the doctrine clear are found in the LXX. Nor are they found in the New Testament; or, if found, they have no reference to eternity.

*αἰεί* is used twice in LXX. of the Old Testament, in two passages only, Psalm xciv. 10 (*not* in the Hebrew or in the English version) and Isaiah li. 13, and in neither place is eternity implied. In the New Testament *αἰεί* does not generally mean eternally in the eight passages where it is found (Mark xv. 8, Tit. i. 12, 1 Pet. iii. 15, etc.).

Strong negative combinations of *οὐδέ*, *οὐτέ*, *οὐ μή*, etc., or similar words, are found, Matthew xii. 32, Mark iii. 29 (*οὐκ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*), *οὐ μή* with *ἔτι*. These are at least as numerous in the New Testament as in the Old.

Ἐς αἰεί is not found either in the Old Testament or in the New, nor is ἄνευ τέλους. πάντοτε is found in the New Testament two and forty times (not eight times, as Dr. Farrar states), and is never found in the Old. In the New it implies eternity in only one or two passages: "The poor ye have *always* with you"; "*always* bearing about in the body," etc.; "*always* ready to give a reason for the hope," etc. "Ever with the Lord" may mean eternally; but it would be a feeble proof, if it stood alone. Εἰς τὸ παντελές and εἰς τὸ διηνεκές are not found in the LXX. In the New Testament παντελής occurs twice (not once) and διηνεκής four times (and not twice only). Eternity is expressed by neither of them in any of the passages. Παντελής, like the other form of the word, ὀλοτελής (1 Thess. v. 23), means complete for all purposes, and διηνεκής means continuous, the (*dictator*) *perpetuus* of the Romans. Any good dictionary will give the meaning; and in Bleek's *Commentary on the Hebrews* the meaning is proved by a large number of passages. See also Luke xiii. 11 (for παντελής), and Hebrews vii. 3 and x. 1 (for διηνεκής). Αἰδῖος is said to be a strong, clear word; but again let me note that it is not found in the LXX. Once it is used in the New Testament of God (Rom. i. 20), and once, in Jude 6 (not of a temporary fire, as Canon Farrar states, p. 388, but) of angels kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto judgment. Both αἰδῖος and αἰώνιος are from αἰεί, and are the only derivatives of αἰεί used in Scripture. Εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας is said to be decisive; but, it is added, it is only used of God. Again the remark applies, neither is it used in the Old Testament, and it is used only once in the New. Moreover is it stronger than εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τῶν αἰῶνων, or than εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, which last phrase with its articles is used in the New Testament to describe God's glory, the Church's blessedness, and the punishment of the

wicked? That *αἰώνιος* "is far more frequently used of things not endless" is surely a mistake. We are dealing with Scripture usage. Sixty-six times *αἰώνιος* is used of future time in the New Testament. Can any student mention six passages, including all that speak of future punishment, in which the things spoken of are not as lasting as the being of God and the blessedness of the redeemed? Even in the case of the Old Testament the result will not be very different if we keep in mind two things: first, when dealing with the Hebrew, a language that expresses its adjectives largely by nouns, we must include *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* and its kindred forms under *αἰώνιος*, and treat both as adjectives; and, secondly, the expressions applied to Israel have allusive reference to the kingdom of Christ and to believers. What is a limited eternity when applied to the type is a real eternity when applied to the antitype. The "for evers" of Psalm lxxii. are not properly limited to the literal "king's son," and the "everlasting joy" of those who return to Zion is not really a blessing that ends with the Jews. Under these two conditions, a very large proportion of the expressions that seem to speak of what is endless really speak of what is endless, and they justify the conclusion that even in the Old Testament the common meaning of *αἰώνιος* and its Hebrew equivalents is eternal. If it is not, then the eternity of the blessed God and the eternity of the blessedness of the righteous are not revealed. In the New Testament certainly the general meaning of the term *αἰώνιος* is clear.

May I not say then, the words which Canon Farrar thinks would make all clear are most of them not used in the Old Testament at all, and in the New are not applied to God and to the blessedness of the righteous? If in a few passages of the LXX. (five in all) there are what seem to him stronger expressions than those used of the wicked

(ἔτι, etc., or its equivalent), then I remark that such expressions are simply variant renderings of Hebrew words which are generally translated by some form or combination of αἰών, and that in fact they are used of the punishment of the wicked as well as of the blessedness of the righteous.

In answer to these facts, Canon Farrar suggests that αἰώνιος does not refer to time at all, but means super-sensuous and spiritual. This notion is not new, but it is modern and peculiar. Three distinct grounds have been assigned for this meaning. First, it is said that αἰών comes from ἄημι, to breathe; and as spiritual comes from *spiro*, to breathe, spiritual is a fair and literal translation. Secondly, it is said αἰῶνες is used in Gnostic philosophy for spiritual beings, emanations from God, good and bad; and as God is a spirit, these emanations are spiritual. A third explanation of this meaning, an explanation adopted by Canon Farrar, is, that as ὁ αἰών οὗτος is "this world," and ὁ αἰών ἐρχόμενος is the future world, the reign of the Messiah and that new world is spiritual, αἰώνιος meaning spiritual. These philological reasons amount to very little. The derivation of αἰών from ἄημι finds small favour with modern lexicographers, as it found none with Aristotle (see *Cremer's* second, third, and fourth editions of Grimm, and Thayer's *Grimm's Wilke's Clavis*). The Gnostic philosophy is later than most of the Old Testament, and cannot have suggested the meaning of αἰώνιος. And as for Canon Farrar's suggestion, that because the coming kingdom is spiritual, therefore αἰώνιος means spiritual, it is liable to the objection that the Jewish αἰών was not spiritual, but earthly, and αἰώνιος alone could not have expressed a *spiritual* quality.

Nor must it be forgotten that αἰών is essentially descriptive of time and duration. Ἄπ' αἰῶνος and εἰς αἰῶνα can have no other meaning; while the adjective αἰώνιος takes its meaning from the Greek noun, and is nearly always in



the LXX. the rendering of the Hebrew noun  $\text{רוּחַ}$  or  $\text{רוּחָ}$ . There is nothing "spiritual" about them, and these words are translated in the Old Testament by *αἰώνιος* upwards of a hundred times.

The general reader can judge for himself of the accuracy of Dr. Farrar's explanation. The coming world or age is spiritual, therefore *αἰώνιος* means spiritual, is the argument. But the Jewish world is called an *αἰών* too. Is that spiritual also? What does Canon Farrar make of the announcement that to God belongs "eternal," *i.e.* spiritual "power" (1 Tim. vi. 16)? How can Christ be said by the eternal Spirit, *i.e.* by a spiritual Spirit (whether His own nature or the Holy Ghost) to have offered Himself unto God (Heb. ix. 14)? How could the gospel have been kept in silence for "spiritual ages," though now revealed (2 Tim. i. 9). How is God blessed unto the spiritualities (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*)? How is glory to be given to Him unto all the spiritualities of spiritualities? How can no fruit be found on the barren fig tree unto the spirituality?

No doubt there are combinations of *αἰών*—eternal life, for example—which make mere continuance of being "very poor" translations of the thought. The Life is itself holy, spiritual, blessed. But this fulness is not in "the eternal," but in "the life." Once understand what the life is—the true life: and eternal life expresses it all, far better than "spiritual, supersensuous existence."

In short, the notion that *αἰώνιος* means supersensuous or spiritual is philologically a mistake, and it makes a poor sense of most of the passages in the New Testament where the expression is found.

I repeat therefore the conclusion to which I had previously come. The three forms of expression used in the New Testament to describe the duration of God's glory and the duration of the blessedness of the righteous are also

the forms used to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. I now widen the statement, and re-affirm that it is equally true of expressions used in the Old Testament. The phrases moreover which Dr. Farrar thinks stronger, and which would have decided the question of the duration of the punishment of the wicked (*ἐς αἰεί*, for example) are either not used in Scripture to describe God's eternity and the blessedness of the righteous, or they are rare and human renderings in the LXX. of Hebrew words which are the common expressions for continued duration, and are as such rendered *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, etc., and are applied to all the three things to which I had affirmed that they are applied. If not found in Scripture at all (as *ἐς αἰεί*), or if found only as very occasional human variants (*καὶ ἔτι*, etc.) used in translating the same Hebrew phrases, nothing can be made of them in connexion with this argument.

In this paper I have kept throughout to questions of philology. Other questions there are, no doubt, connected with this awful theme; but they are beyond my present purpose. One practical lesson remains.

Every form of words employed in the Gospels to describe the everness of the Divine nature and the blessedness of the righteous is employed to describe the everness of the punishment of the wicked. The last two are generally found in the same context, each the complement of the other. The same terms are used by Paul in his Epistles for the same purposes. In Revelation, the form used to describe everness is the strongest of all—*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*. Whatever terms are used in the Old Testament to describe the first two are used also to describe the third. These words are used everywhere without qualification of any kind, and again and again. There is no hint in any of these contexts of a larger hope; and no suspicion seems to be felt by the writers that their message dis-

honours God or shocks the consciences of men. Is it not our safer course to deliver the gospel as Christ delivered it, and Paul and John? We may think that "destruction" is literal, and that the time will come when all sin and sinners will have ceased out of the universe of God. We may think that Christ's supremacy means that all intelligent natures will be at last lovingly subject to Him, and that the enemies who become "the footstool of His feet" are among His dearest friends. Finding relief in such an issue, we may be tempted to omit or to tone down or to explain away the sharp, strong, decisive utterances of our Lord addressed so often to the selfish, the impenitent, and the disbelieving. But this temptation we must resist. Christ, who was love and righteousness incarnate, who knew the meaning of all the texts that are quoted in favour of a larger hope, never allowed them to stifle His warnings or to soften His descriptions of "the wrath to come." To preach to sinners a larger hope, *i.e.* another chance, or the final salvation of all men, is not the message of the gospel. It is without sanction in appeals of inspired men; and it may precipitate the very ruin it professes to deplore. Fear and love are both among the motives whereby men are drawn to God; and it is at our peril that we cease to use either of them. Surely it is not too much to ask that we use Christ's own warnings, and so commend our message to men's consciences as well as to their hearts. To find offence in Him or in His words is not the spirit of faithful servants.

JOSEPH ANGUS.

---

## NEHEMIAH.

THE reforms accomplished by Ezra, vigorous as they were, proved to be of brief duration. When the book of Nehemiah opens, and discloses the state of affairs at Jerusalem thirteen years after Ezra's arrival, it is with disappointment the reader perceives that zeal and energy have been spent in vain. Priests and laymen alike have resumed their foreign wives. The walls are still unbuilt. The country round is occupied by hostile bands of Samaritans and Arabs. Ezra himself is no longer governor. When tidings of this lamentable state of matters was brought to Nehemiah, at the court in Shushan, he was so deeply moved that the king could not but notice his altered aspect. Chosen to act as cup-bearer on account of his pleasant appearance, his depressed and anxious expression was all the more readily noticed. He was not like himself. Artaxerxes, on learning the cause of his distress, grants him leave of absence and a commission to build the walls of Jerusalem. This was in the year 446 B.C. Nehemiah's work in Jerusalem, then, naturally falls into two parts. He sheltered the work of Ezra so that it bore its natural fruit; and he accomplished an important work of his own.

Ezra had restored the law to its proper place in the life of the people. He had done so by his own purity of intention, and by the strength of character of one or two of his associates. But how was he to secure for the law the permanent and universal regard of the people? First, he had to ascertain and declare what the law really was. The fact that he brought with him from Babylonia men who were acquainted with the law, and prepared to interpret it, proves that among the Jews of the Captivity there existed copies of the law. In what condition these copies of the law were, we do not know; nor do we know how far we are indebted to Ezra for the condition in which we now have

the books of Moses. It is quite likely that Ezra, during the twelve years subsequent to his arrival at Jerusalem, was busy with his fellow scribes revising these books, collecting and collating such manuscripts as may have survived the demolition of Jerusalem, and multiplying copies. These five books of Moses, in one form or other, were the Bible of Ezra's time, and it was to the law therein contained that the people swore obedience.

But it could scarcely fail to occur to scribes engaged in this work, that it would be an interesting and useful work to collect also all the extant remains of the Hebrew prophets. This however was a much more difficult task. Jeremiah seems to have been careful to secure the preservation of the very words he spoke. But he was apparently an exception. And now centuries have elapsed since some of the prophets had spoken, and during these centuries the land had been trodden and wasted by so many conquering and plundering armies that the wonder is, not that so little, but that so much was found to be extant of the ancient literature. But laborious as the unearthing of these treasures must have been, the task of identifying them must have been more delicate and difficult still; for some of the prophecies survived anonymously. A leaf or two of papyrus, a strip or two of parchment, which might task the sagacity of the keenest critic, was sometimes all that was left. A few sentences, without date or signature, but bearing in their contents proof that they were worthy to be ranked with Isaiah and Hosea—these were what Ezra and his fellow editors had to find a place for. And yet with such integrity and sagacity was the work carried through, that from that day to this it has stood virtually untouched; and, so far as the law and the prophets are concerned, our Bible is the Bible of Ezra and Nehemiah.

But when Ezra had gathered and transcribed in a fair clean copy the books of Moses in the language in which



they had been written, his work was by no means finished; for few of the people could now understand Hebrew. Before the time of the Captivity an Aramaic dialect prevailed among all the tribes of Syria and Mesopotamia down to Babylonia itself. And as the carrying trade was entirely in the hands of these tribes, knowledge of the common tongue in which trade was everywhere carried on was essential. Aramaic thus became what Greek was in the time of the empire, Spanish in South America, French in modern Europe, and what English bids fair to be all the world over. To a people who had forgotten their Hebrew and understood only Aramaic, it was useless to read Moses in his own tongue. Interpreters who understood both languages were therefore appointed by Ezra to "give the sense." This, we are told, was done in the first great gatherings of the people in Jerusalem. And afterwards the same custom spread to the towns and villages. The people, with little in their own condition to glory in, were pleased to hear, Sabbath after Sabbath, the record of their fathers' deeds, and the great history and legislation of primitive times.

And thus, in all probability did the institution of the Synagogue originate. Thus also was begotten the need of educated, trained, professional scribes. And with this class sprang into being many rules for the reading of Scripture, some of them wise, some foolish. Scripture was distributed into three kinds of passages: those which might both be read and interpreted, those which might be read but not interpreted, those which might neither be read nor interpreted. Regard was had to the ignorance of the hearer, and the interpreter was enjoined to explain such expressions as might be misunderstood, and as might convey to the hearer's mind any grossly anthropomorphic idea, or any thought which might lower the true dignity of God.

Lastly, the law had not only to be ascertained and inter-

preted, it had also to be administered. Since first it was given, the circumstances of the people were greatly altered, and there was difficulty in seeing how the old law should be applied to the new condition of things. Questions about inheritance, distribution of land, remission of debts, atonements for various offences, were continually referred to the scribes for their decision. And, as in some other countries, so among the Jews, these decisions and explanations gradually assumed an authority little, if at all, inferior to that of the law itself; so that when the Messiah came to His kingdom He found the law overlaid and buried and choked by a mass of tradition. There was no getting to the naked law through the explanatory matter it had accumulated around it.

Some such work as this was accomplished by Ezra after Nehemiah's arrival at Jerusalem.

Turning to Nehemiah himself, we are first struck with the interest he felt in Jerusalem, and the readiness with which he abandoned his own position in the Persian court and devoted himself to his people. He was young, and he lived among the varied temptations of court life; but under all he carried a heart throbbing with love of his kindred. His own success did not tempt him to neglect as hopeless his less successful fellow countrymen. He was willing to burden and darken his own bright and easy career by uniting himself with inglorious and helpless people. More than this a young man need not do to show he has the root of the matter in him. To break or interrupt one's own career when it is most promising, and to link oneself to the obscure lot of unpromising people, is a noble form of self-sacrifice, and one that is constantly required in society.

Looking a little deeper into the character of Nehemiah, we detect in him a trained conscientiousness, which does not content itself with rejecting temptation, but is quick to recognise duty. He had what some men have in a much

higher degree than others, a sense of the conduct befitting his position. This appears very strikingly when his enemies, Tobias and Sanballat, suborn a prophet to persuade him that he is to be assassinated, and that his only safety lies in taking refuge in the Temple. They knew that if he yielded and fled to the Temple his influence would from that hour be gone. But to the prophet's ill-omened and lugubrious utterances Nehemiah firmly answers: "Should such a man as I flee? and who is there, that, being as I am, would go into the Temple to save his life? I will not go in." This was not mere bravery, though there was bravery in it. It was the bravery of a man who recognised what was due to his position. It was the feeling which animates many an officer in the army who is gifted with no exceptional physical courage, and who yet, through the instinctive sense of what is expected of him, undertakes risks and faces dangers alongside of the most courageous. It is the same feeling which nerves medical men to enter infected houses, public officials to retain posts and to carry through great undertakings, though they are thereby exposed to ungenerous and ignorant criticism, the opposition of virulent and unscrupulous men, and years of hardship and toil. It is the root motive of much of the best work that men do.

But Nehemiah had the defects of his qualities. He did not escape the self-consciousness which accompanies an habitual consideration of what is due to one's position. He wrote his own history, and betrays some of the over-minute self-consideration of the autobiographer. It is open to every one to observe that men who can never forget their official station, although they are often useful public men, are yet apt to be pompous, dry, and artificial. The man who gives a handsome subscription because it is expected of him does a correct and useful thing, but that is all. The official who is constantly remembering the position he holds,—who, as it were, never appears in plain clothes,

who never, with Sir Thomas More, lays aside his robes of office, saying, "Lie there, Lord Chancellor,"—is not the highest type of man.

But the danger to character which accompanies consideration of our position must not blind us to the duty of imitating the Nehemiahs who never do anything unbecoming their rank in life, their education, their Christian standing, their position as parents or children or relatives in any degree. It is a man's first business to ascertain the relations he holds to others, and what these relations require. It is his first business to take a candid and close survey of his position in life, and set clearly before him the duties of his position. Many persons neglect their duty as citizens, they take no interest in public matters, but let them go as others see fit to guide them. How different would the life in many families be, if the parents occasionally put to themselves the simple and very obvious question, Am I doing everything which my position as a parent requires? Could the strictest investigation detect no omission? How much of the injury and injustice of life results from mere want of consideration, from the lack of all careful endeavour clearly to see what justice and mercy require of us towards the actual persons we are every day in contact with. Am I employed by others? Then have I entered into my employers' views of my duties? Do I employ others? Then this relationship carries with it certain duties and responsibilities. From every relationship we hold, from every capacity in which we deal with men, from our whole circumstances and position in life, there arise duties which we should face with the same manly and honest dignity as Nehemiah.

Another striking feature in Nehemiah's character, is the combination of self-reliance and trust in God. Untiring energy and prayerful habits were never more happily fused than in him. He prays as if God were to do everything:

he works as if all depended on himself. His self-reliance appeared as soon as he reached Jerusalem. He did not call a meeting and hear reports from this man and that; he did not summon the leading men and ask them what they thought he should do. He waited till night fell and every one was under his own roof, and then he saddled his ass and rode round the city walls, making his own observations; and having formed his plan he then summoned the people and told them what was to be done. Here was a man entirely self-reliant. But his dependence on God is equally conspicuous. Unless God is with him, he has no heart for the task laid upon him. "The God of heaven, He will prosper us; therefore we His servants will arise and build." When the Samaritans gathered to attack the people whom they had long been used to despise as "these feeble Jews," the same harmony between work and prayer is discernible in Nehemiah's words, "We made our prayer unto God, and set a watch against them day and night." Here is a man with whom there is no weak waiting upon Providence, and yet who is possessed by a spirit of entire dependence on God.

Nehemiah, in short, seemed to escape the Scylla and Charybdis of prayer, neither allowing it to slack his energy nor leaving it wholly out of his life. The sentiment so often met with in modern thought, that the best prayer is hard work, and that no words are needed, is not so irreligious as it seems. It is at any rate true, that the man who is conscious he is striving only to do what God desires should be done may at times feel that God understands him and is with him, and that there is no call for laboured explanations. And of the two extremes it is certainly wiser to labour without articulate prayer than to pray without labour. If our prayers slacken our energies instead of bracing them, if they produce the feeling that things will turn out well whether we take all the pains or no, they are



hurtful. The truest prayer is the ever-renewed and untiring energy of the man who consecrates his whole life to God, who has found the secret of doing all in God and for God, and who has learned to consider himself as merely the organ and instrument of the Divine life and energy. But without express and uttered prayer this condition of harmony with God will scarcely be maintained. Prayer is the natural utterance and needed stimulus of such a state.

The business-like vigour with which Nehemiah governed Jerusalem, the strength of character with which he bore up against the repining and treachery within the city, and the watchfulness, courage, spirit, and cleverness with which he defeated all the plots of his enemies outside, were qualities which fitted him for a command of greater importance than this governorship. But he had at all events the satisfaction of finishing one solid piece of work. He had not lived in vain, nor frittered away his days in a muddle of half-achieved projects. Through risks innumerable, at great pecuniary cost, with self-denial in many forms, he brought his task to an end, and at last saw Jerusalem ringed round with a wall of which the Samaritans would now be the last to say that if a fox leapt upon it, it would crumble under his foot. To celebrate the completion of this work Nehemiah organized a procession of as much magnificence as could be furnished forth by the means at his disposal. Singers and musicians were invited from the surrounding country, the great men and officials were marshalled in due order, and the people being divided into two great bodies, one company headed by Ezra and accompanied by bands of music marched round the walls in one direction, while Nehemiah with the other company went in the opposite direction. The shouts and cheers of the people were heard far over the country. And it was probably during this enthusiasm that the people swore to their national covenant, and pledged themselves to keep

the Sabbath, to abstain from mixed marriages, and to furnish the requisite maintenance to the Levites.

Satisfied with the work he had accomplished, Nehemiah returned to report himself at the Persian court; but on obtaining a renewal of his leave of absence and returning to Jerusalem, he was dismayed and chagrined to find all his work undone. The service of God was abandoned, as the Levites, unsupported by the people, were compelled to go and seek a livelihood in agriculture or trade. A fish-market was regularly held on Sabbath; and on that day, which they had sworn to keep sacred from labour, all kinds of food were bought and sold, the harvest was secured, the grapes were pressed. To a man like Nehemiah nothing could be more exasperating than thus to find his laborious reforms summarily obliterated. The heat of temper he showed may be pardoned, while the boldness and resolution he displayed in stemming the popular tide and insisting that the law should be kept, though the whole trade of Jerusalem was against him, may well be appreciated and admired by a generation like ours that dares not insist on any reform which involves pecuniary sacrifice or injury to the interests of property and trade.

The position in which Nehemiah was thus placed, as fighting for the law almost single-handed, had an effect upon his character not altogether good. An eager apologist might indeed find excuse for the self-consciousness he displays in his own record of these events. But every one who reads the last chapter of his book without prepossession feels somewhat shocked at the tone in which he records his reforms. He need not have so insisted on our recognising that he was the only bulwark against the evils of his time. He might have left us to draw that conclusion, without the obtrusive, "I testified against them," "I contended with them." The regular refrain, too, with which he closes each section jars upon us, "Remember

me, O my God, for good," manifestly reckoning that his service, his good deeds, gave him a claim on God. So indeed in a sense they did. "God is not unjust to forget your labour of love." But there is so much else than service in a man's life, that when he himself emphasises the good he has done, and shows no consciousness of any defect, omission, or unworthiness, our sense of proportion is shocked.

Self-righteousness is the snare of reformers in private as in public life. Inveighing against one vice, to which they themselves have no temptation, they learn to judge all men, themselves included, by that one vice; and on the score of their own exemption from it gradually and unconsciously assume the airs of perfected persons. Unless the general and thorough reformation of the reformer himself goes hand-in-hand with social reformation, and unless he keeps a strict watch on his own character, it is at the greatest risk he assumes the function of a censor of morals. Inconsistent and imperfect morality, hardness, self-righteousness are the certain doom of all who, in their zeal to reform the lives of others, forget that they themselves need reformation, and assume the attitude of superior beings, and not the meekness and loving humility of those who themselves also are tempted.

But instead of dealing out what may, after all, be a mistaken judgment on one who at all events threw himself vigorously into the needed work of his day, we may be more profitably employed in considering how our own work shows when laid alongside of his. The first thing, doubtless, which will occur to many of us is, that if we sat down to write our autobiography we could not have so complacent a retrospect as Nehemiah. We could not set down in black and white any great sacrifices, twelve years given to the service of others, any definite conquest of prevalent evil, any accomplished work of permanent benefit

to mankind. Few may seem to have within their reach opportunity of great service. And yet until we actually make the attempt it is impossible to say what is or is not within our reach. And what is life worth, if in the retrospect we see nothing generous and self-sacrificing, nothing richly profitable to any one, rising above the flat commonplace and daily routine of common toil? It is not our position in life that is at fault, nor altogether our position that gives us our opportunity. A man's life is determined from within, and his usefulness or uselessness is measured by his capacity for self-sacrifice.

MARCUS DODS.

---

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

VI.

“Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord: refresh my heart in Christ. Having confidence in thine obedience I write unto thee, knowing that thou wilt do even beyond what I say. But withal prepare me a lodging: for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you.

“Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus, saluteth thee; and so do Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, my fellow workers.

“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen.”—PHILEM. 20-25 (Rev. Ver.).

WE have already had occasion to point out that Paul's pleading with Philemon, and the motives which he adduces, are expressions, on a lower level, of the greatest principles of Christian ethics. If the closing salutations be left out of sight for the moment, there are here three verses, each containing a thought which needs only to be cast into its most general form to show itself as a large Christian truth.

I. Verse 20 gives the final moving form of the Apostle's request. Onesimus disappears, and the final plea is based altogether on the fact that compliance will pleasure and help Paul. There is but the faintest gleam of a possible

allusion to the former in the use of the verb from which the name Onesimus is derived—"Let me have *help* of thee"; as if he had said, "Be you an Onesimus, a helpful one to me, as I trust he is going to be to you." "Refresh my heart" points back to *v.* 7, "The hearts of the saints have been refreshed by thee," and lightly suggests that Philemon should do for Paul what he had done for many others. But the Apostle does not merely ask help and refreshing; he desires that they should be of a right Christian sort. "In Christ" is very significant. If Philemon receives his slave for Christ's sake and in the strength of that communion with Christ which fits for all virtue, and so for this good deed—a deed which is of too high and rare a strain of goodness for his unaided nature,—then "in Christ" he will be helpful to the Apostle. In that case, the phrase expresses the element or sphere in which the act is done. But it may apply rather, or even also, to Paul, and then it expresses the element or sphere in which he is helped and refreshed. In communion with Jesus, taught and inspired by Him, the Apostle is brought to such true and tender sympathy with the runaway that his heart is refreshed, as by a cup of cold water, by kindness shown to him. Such keen sympathy is as much beyond the reach of nature as Philemon's kindness would be. Both are "in Christ." Union with Him refines selfishness, and makes men quick to feel another's sorrows and joys as theirs, after the pattern of Him who makes the case of God's fugitives His own. It makes them easy to be entreated and ready to forgive. So to be in Him is to be sympathetic like Paul, and placable as he would have Onesimus. "In Christ" carries in it the secret of all sweet humanities and beneficence, is the spell which calls out fairest charity, and is the only victorious antagonist of harshness and selfishness.

The request for the sake of which the whole letter is written is here put as a kindness to Paul himself, and thus



an entirely different motive is appealed to. "Surely you would be glad to give me pleasure. Then do this thing which I ask you." It is permissible to seek to draw to virtuous acts by such a motive, and to reinforce higher reasons by the desire to please dear ones, or to win the approbation of the wise and good. It must be rigidly kept as a subsidiary motive, and distinguished from the mere love of applause. Most men have some one whose opinion of their acts is a kind of embodied conscience, and whose satisfaction is reward. But pleasing the dearest and purest among men can never be more than at most a crutch to help lameness or a spur to stimulate.

If however this motive be lifted to the higher level, and these words thought of as Paul's echo of Christ's appeal to those who love Him, they beautifully express the peculiar blessedness of Christian ethics. The strongest motive, the very mainspring and pulsing heart of Christian duty, is to please Christ. His language to His followers is not, "Do this because it is right," but "Do this because it pleaseth Me." They have a living Person to gratify, not a mere law of duty to obey. The help which is given to weakness by the hope of winning golden opinions from, or giving pleasure to, those whom men love is transferred to the Christian relation to Jesus. So the cold thought of duty is warmed, and the weight of obedience to a stony, impersonal law is lightened, and a new power is enlisted on the side of goodness, which sways more mightily than all the abstractions of duty. The Christ Himself makes His appeal to men in the same tender fashion as Paul to Philemon. He will move to holy obedience by the thought—wonderful as it is—that it gladdens Him. Many a weak heart has been braced and made capable of heroisms of endurance and effort, and of angel deeds of mercy, all beyond its own strength, by that great thought, "We labour that, whether present or absent, we may be well-pleasing to Him."

II. Verse 21 exhibits love commanding, in the confidence of love obeying. "Having confidence in thine obedience I write unto thee, knowing that thou wilt do even beyond what I say." In *v.* 8 the Apostle had waived his right to enjoin, because he had rather speak the speech of love, and request. But here, with the slightest possible touch, he just lets the note of authority sound for a single moment, and then passes into the old music of affection and trust. He but names the word "obedience," and that in such a way as to present it as the child of love, and the privilege of his friend. He trusts Philemon's obedience, because he knows his love, and is sure that it is love of such a sort as will not stand on the exact measure, but will delight in giving it "pressed down and running over."

What could he mean by "do more than I say"? Was he hinting at emancipation, which he would rather have to come from Philemon's own sense of what was due to the slave who was now a brother, than be granted, perhaps hesitatingly, in deference to his request? Possibly, but more probably he had no definite thing in his mind, but only desired to express his loving confidence in his friend's willingness to please him. Commands given in such a tone, where authority audibly trusts the subordinate, are far more likely to be obeyed than if they were shouted with the hoarse voice of a drill-sergeant. Men will do much to fulfil generous expectations. Even debased natures will respond to such appeal; and if they see that good is expected from them, that will go far to evoke it. Some masters have always good servants, and part of the secret is that they trust them to obey. "England expects" fulfilled itself. When love enjoins there should be trust in its tones. It will act like a magnet to draw reluctant feet into the path of duty. A will which mere authority could not bend, like iron when cold, may be made flexible when warmed by this gentle heat. If parents oftener let their children feel that

they had confidence in their obedience, they would seldomer have to complain of their disobedience.

Christ's commands follow, or rather set, this pattern. He trusts His servants, and speaks to them in a voice softened and confiding. He tells them His wish, and commits Himself and His cause to His disciples' love.

Obedience beyond the strict limits of command will always be given by love. It is a poor, grudging service which weighs obedience as a chemist does some precious medicine, and is careful that not the hundredth part of a grain more than the prescribed amount shall be doled out. A hired workman will fling down his lifted trowel full of mortar at the first stroke of the clock, though it would be easier to lay it on the bricks; but where affection moves the hand, it is delight to add something over and above to bare duty. The artist, who loves his work, will put many a touch on it, beyond the minimum which will fulfil his contract. Those who adequately feel the power of Christian motives will not be anxious to find the least that they durst, but the most that they can do. If obvious duty requires them to go a mile, they will rather go two, than be scrupulous to stop as soon as they see the milestone. A child who is always trying to find out how little would satisfy his father cannot have much love. Obedience to Christ is joy, peace, life. The grudging servants are limiting their possession of these, by limiting their active surrender of themselves. They seem to be afraid of having too much of these blessings. A heart truly touched by the love of Jesus Christ will not seek to know the lowest limit of duty, but the highest possibility of service.

“Give all thou canst; high heaven rejects the lore  
Of nicely calculated less or more.”

III. Verse 22 may be summed up as the language of love, hoping for reunion. “Withal prepare me a lodging:

for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you." We do not know whether the Apostle's expectation was fulfilled. Believing that he was set free from his first imprisonment, and that his second was separated from it by a considerable interval, during which he visited Macedonia and Asia Minor, we have yet nothing to show whether or not he reached Colossæ; but whether fulfilled or not, the expectation of meeting would tend to secure compliance with his request, and would be all the more likely to do so, for the very delicacy with which it is stated, so as not to seem to be mentioned for the sake of adding force to his intercession.

The limits of Paul's expectation as to the power of his brethren's prayers for temporal blessings are worth noting. He does believe that these good people in Colossæ could help him by prayer for his liberation, but he does not believe that their prayer will certainly be heard. In some circles much is said now about "the prayer of faith"—a phrase which, singularly enough, is in such cases almost confined to prayers for external blessings,—and about its power to bring money for work which the person praying believes to be desirable, or to send away diseases. But surely there can be no "faith" without a definite Divine *word* to lay hold of. Faith and God's promise are correlative; and unless a man has God's plain promise that A. B. will be cured by his prayer, the belief that he will is not faith but something deserving a much less noble name. The prayer of faith is not forcing our wills on God, but bending our wills to God's. The prayer which Christ has taught in regard to all outward things is, "Not my will, but Thine be done," and, "May Thy will become mine." That is the prayer of faith, which is always answered. The Church prayed for Peter, and he was delivered; the Church, no doubt, prayed for Stephen, and he was stoned. Was then the prayer for him refused? Not so, but if it were prayer

at all, the inmost meaning of it was "be it as Thou wilt"; and that was accepted and answered. Petitions for outward blessings, whether for the petitioner or for others, are to be presented with submission; and the highest confidence which can be entertained concerning them is that which Paul here expresses: "I *hope* that through your prayers I shall be set free."

The prospect of meeting enhances the force of the Apostle's wish; nor are Christians without an analogous motive to give weight to their obligations to their Lord. Just as Paul quickened Philemon's loving wish to serve him by the thought that he might have the gladness of seeing him before long, so Christ quickens His servants' diligence by the thought that before very many days He will come, or they will go—at any rate, they will be with Him,—and He will see what they have been doing in His absence. Such a prospect should increase diligence, and should not inspire terror. It is a mark of true Christians that they "love His appearing." Their hearts should glow at the hope of meeting. That hope should make work happier and lighter. When a husband has been away at sea, the prospect of his return makes the wife sing at her work, and take more pains or rather pleasure with it, because his eye is to see it. So should it be with the bride in the prospect of her Bridegroom's return. The Church should not be driven to unwelcome duties by the fear of a strict judgment, but drawn to large, cheerful service, by the hope of spreading her work before her returning Lord.

Thus, on the whole, in this letter, the central springs of Christian service are touched, and the motives used to sway Philemon are the echo of the motives which Christ uses to sway men. The key-note of all is love. Love beseeches when it might command. To love we owe our own selves beside. Love will do nothing without the glad



consent of him to whom it speaks, and cares for no service which is of necessity. Its finest wine is not made from juice which is pressed out of the grapes, but from that which flows from them for very ripeness. Love identifies itself with those who need its help, and treats kindnesses to them as done to itself. Love finds joy and heart solace in willing, though it be imperfect, service. Love expects more than it asks. Love hopes for reunion, and by the hope makes its wish more weighty. These are the points of Paul's pleading with Philemon. Are they not the elements of Christ's pleading with His friends?

He too prefers the tone of friendship to that of authority. To Him His servants owe themselves, and remain for ever in His debt, after all payment of reverence and thankful self-surrender. He does not count constrained service as service at all, and has only volunteers in His army. He makes Himself one with the needy, and counts kindness to the least as done to Him. He binds Himself to repay and overpay all sacrifice in His service. He finds delight in His people's work. He asks them to prepare an abode for Him in their own hearts, and in souls opened by their agency for His entrance. He has gone to prepare a mansion for them, and He comes to receive account of their obedience and to crown their poor deeds. It is impossible to suppose that Paul's pleading for Philemon failed. How much less powerful is Christ's, even with those who love Him best!

IV. The parting greetings may be very briefly considered, for much that would have naturally been said about them has already presented itself in dealing with the similar salutations in the epistle to Colossæ. The same people send messages here as there; only Jesus called Justus being omitted, probably for no other reason than because he was not at hand at the moment. Epaphras is naturally mentioned singly, as being a Colossian, and therefore more closely connected with Philemon than were the

others. After him come the two Jews and the two Gentiles, as in Colossians.

The parting benediction ends the letter. At the beginning of the epistle Paul invoked grace upon the household "from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." Now he conceives of it as Christ's gift. In Him all the stooping, bestowing love of God is gathered, that from Him it may be poured on the world. That grace is not diffused like stellar light, through some nebulous heaven, but concentrated in the Sun of righteousness, who is the light of men. That fire is piled on a hearth that, from it, warmth may ray out to all that are in the house.

That grace has man's spirit for the field of its highest operation. Thither it can enter, and there it can abide, in union more close and communion more real and blessed than aught else can attain. The spirit which has the grace of Christ with it can never be utterly solitary or desolate.

The grace of Christ is the best bond of family life. Here it is prayed for on behalf of all the group, the husband, wife, child, and the friends in their home-Church. Like grains of sweet incense cast on an altar flame, and making fragrant what was already holy, that grace sprinkled on the household fire will give it an odour of a sweet smell, grateful to men and acceptable to God.

That wish is the purest expression of Christian friendship, of which the whole letter is so exquisite an example. Written as it is about a common, every-day matter, which could have been settled without a single religious reference, it is saturated with Christian thought and feeling. So it becomes an example of how to blend Christian sentiment with ordinary affairs, and to carry a Christian atmosphere everywhere. Friendship and social intercourse will be all the nobler and happier, if pervaded by such a tone. Such words as these closing ones would be a sad contrast to much of the intercourse of professedly Christian men.

But every Christian ought by his life to be, as it were, floating the grace of God to others sinking for want of it to lay hold of, and all his speech should be of a piece with this benediction.

A Christian's life should be "an epistle of Christ" written with His own hand, wherein dim eyes might read the transcript of His own gracious love, and through all his works and deeds should shine the image of his Master, even as it does through the delicate tendernesses and gracious pleadings of this pure pearl of a letter, which the slave, become a brother, bore to the responsive hearts in quiet Colossæ.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

---

### SISERA AND JAEL.

JUDGES iv. 17-23.

THE welcome ray of light that has been shed on the confessedly dark transaction of Sisera's tragical death, by Captain Conder's *Tent Work in Palestine*, seems scarcely to have attracted the attention it deserves, or the interest it is fitted to awaken, although it is also fully noticed in Mr. Neil's interesting book, *Palestine Explored* (p. 8). In the *Student's Commentary* the previous lines of explanation are given in these words: "Deborah speaks of Jael's deed in the light of her own age, which did not make manifest the evil of guile and bloodshed; the light of ours does." But what Dr. Chalmers justly termed "the progressive morality" of the Biblical history, whilst applicable to other instances, furnishes no explanation or this very peculiar case. It was always evident that for its elucidation, and for our understanding of Deborah's unqualified praise, there must have been some ancient Eastern clue that had been lost in modern times or unknown in the West; and the recent finding of this clue comes to us with equal surprise and satisfaction.

To plead in extenuation of Jael's deed that the moral standard of her age was lower than ours sheds no light on her singular conduct; because, if taken apart from any Divine direction, it stands forth to us as a flagrant breach of the laws of hospitality, and in the eyes of a matron in a nomad tribe dwelling in tents, those laws were tenfold more sacred than in ours. The supreme sacredness of hospitality amongst such tribes is well brought out in the familiar story of the Arab robber, who had entered a palace by night and had found his way to the jewel room, where, groping in the dark, he laid his hand on a bowl full of pearls, which he mistook for a bowl of salt, and instantly fled; for now he could not wrong by one hair of his head the man in whose house he had touched that inviolable seal of friendship. The laws of morality were ropes of sand to the midnight robber; and if the laws of hospitality were supremely sacred even to him, their bonds must have been still more stringent when the moral character was high although with a conscience only partially enlightened. On this ground we have always held that, alike to Jael and to Deborah, the entire transaction must have been consistent with their high code of hospitality, although how it could so consist we were quite at a loss to conceive.

Toward the solution of a scriptural question, not indeed of primary importance, yet of considerable interest, devout students of the Bible must have read with a sense of relief and gratitude the following lucid explanation of the transaction by Captain Conder, while they may not agree in all the motives he ascribes to the Kenite heroine.

“The murder of a fugitive and a guest is so contrary to the morality of the Semitic nomads that we must seek for a very strong justification. It could not have been national enthusiasm which actuated Jael, for she was a Kenite, not a Jewess,—one of a nation hostile to Israel, and

there 'was peace between Jabin, king of Hazor (Sisera's master), and the house of Heber the Kenite.' The true reason is probably to be sought in Sisera's entering the tent at all. There are instances in later history in which a defeated Arab has sheltered himself in the women's apartments, but such an infringement of Eastern etiquette has always been punished by death; and it is not improbable that in revenge for such an insult Jael seized the iron tent-peg and drove it with the mallet, used to fix the tents to the ground, through Sisera's brain."<sup>1</sup>

There is, however, no ground for the supposition that the house of Heber was "hostile to Israel," for it is expressly stated that he was "of the children of Hobab, the father (brother, R.V.) in law of Moses," with whom Israel from the first were evidently on the most friendly terms; and the Kenite inhabitants of Canaan, whose land was promised to Abraham (Gen. xv. 19), must have been a different people. At the outset of his expedition against Amalek, "Saul said unto the Kenites, Go, depart, get you down from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them: for ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt" (1 Sam. xv. 6). And David afterwards sent gifts "to them which were in the cities of the Kenites" with the significant message, "Behold a present for you of the spoil of the enemies of the Lord" (1 Sam. xxx. 26, 29). Those to whom he sent a present "of the spoil of the enemies of Jehovah" must have been numbered, not only with David's friends, but with the friends of the God of Israel.

From the whole narrative, we cannot but agree with those who hold that the Gentile heroine was in spiritual sympathy with the Hebrew prophetess, and that she slew Sisera, not "in revenge for insult," but in holy zeal for

<sup>1</sup> *Tent Work in Palestine*, p. 133; *Twenty-one Years' Work in the Holy Land*, p. 85.



the God of Israel and in love for His oppressed people. The plain of Zaanaim where Heber had pitched his tent was "by Kedesh"; and this Kedesh is placed by Captain Conder on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and only twelve miles from Mount Tabor, probably less from the field of battle. As Kedesh where Israel assembled was the home of Barak, and as Jael knew both him and Sisera, and recognised them at once when they came near her tent, she might also have known Deborah, who had previously gone with Barak to Kedesh (*v.* 9). Deborah commends her in her Song as if well known by name and character. The Hebrew prophetess sings of her as one who came to the help of the Lord: "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be, blessed shall she be above women in the tent." In extreme contrast to the double curse on the inhabitants of Meroz, who came not to the help of the Lord, is the double blessing on the wife of Heber the Kenite, who had come so signally to the help of the Lord against the mighty. The Gentile matron, through faith in the God of Israel, overcomes all fear in the avenging of His holy Name, when so many of the men of Israel held back in unbelief and selfishness: they bringing on themselves a curse for their unholy cowardice; she inheriting the blessing that might else have rested on them.

The following estimate of Jael's character was written before the information already quoted had thrown new light on what is termed her "treachery and violence," but is otherwise as just as it is appreciative: "If we can overlook the treachery and violence which belonged to the morals of the age and country, and bear in mind Jael's ardent sympathies with the oppressed people of God, her

faith in the right of Israel to possess the land in which they were now slaves, her zeal for the glory of Jehovah as against the gods of Canaan, and the heroic courage and firmness with which she executed her deadly purpose, we shall be ready to yield to her the praise which is her due.”<sup>1</sup>

With mingled wonder at the sight and gratitude to the God of Israel, Jael espies the haughty leader of the “nine hundred chariots of iron,” and of the vast “multitude” that followed them, running by himself alone across the pastoral plain; and then, with mingled surprise and fear, she sees that not her husband’s tent but her own is the object of his flight. It is a moment of suspense and danger, because the design of the reckless and desperate man may be to save his own life by taking hers, and secreting himself in her tent in the hope that no search will be made for him there. But the crisis of alarm quickly opens before her a door of hope; for by repairing to her tent instead of Heber’s he has forfeited his life to her husband, who will certainly avenge the unpardonable wrong that has been done to him. The law of God had set a sacred hedge around domestic life by condemning the adulterer to death; and the unwritten law of the nomad tent had drawn a second circle round it by including in the same condemnation the intruder into the wife’s apartment. The husband is not here to avenge himself and her, and it is most lawful in her eyes to avenge her own honour for the heinous affront which the offender’s high rank alone could have emboldened him to offer.

But while the faithful wife of Heber feels herself justified in demanding or in taking the life of the presumptuous aggressor, she is moved by a higher impulse to put him to death. This cruel oppressor of the Lord’s people during twenty years, the chief prop in God’s holy land of the bloody and obscene rites of the gods of Canaan, now stands

<sup>1</sup> *Student’s Commentary.*

before her: and the deliverance of Israel from a second Egyptian bondage, and the cleansing of the land from the vilest of all idolatries, are only half secured if he shall escape with his life. The heroic woman resolves, in the strength of the God of Israel, that he shall not escape out of her hands; and at the same time resolves on the only plan that seems to her possible in the very peculiar case. Her invitation to enter the tent is only asking him to complete his own attempt of lawless aggression, whilst the refusal or delay of admission might have been at the cost of her life; and after his breathless haste to reach it, the very significant fact of his sudden hesitation at the tent door, with his face betraying his "fear" to enter, clearly reveals his consciousness that the intrusion is at the peril of his life if any of Heber's men observe it. To the like effect is the injunction to Jael, "Stand in the door of the tent, and it shall be, when any man doth come and inquire of thee, and say, Is there any man here? that thou shalt say, No." When the God of Israel bowed the heavens on his people's behalf, "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," and when "that ancient river, the river Kishon," overflowed its banks, Sisera's chariot probably stuck fast in the marshes of the plain, so that he was compelled to flee away on foot. In his flight he took the opposite direction from that of his scattered host, and when he ran toward Jael's tent his pursuers were certainly not within sight, for if they had seen him enter it no precaution of secrecy could have saved him. His charge to Jael seems therefore to have referred in the first instance to Heber's men; for although most of them appear to have been absent with their flocks, some lingerer about his tents might have noticed the direction taken by the fugitive, and if coming to inquire might have led to the taking of his life. Afterwards, when Barak has reached Jael's tent, he makes no inquiry there, as if it were secure from all sus-

picion, and is apparently hastening past, when she accosts him with the tidings that "the man whom he is seeking" is already dead.

The guile, however, of Jael's assurance to Sisera in the words, "fear not," can never be justified. When she uttered it she appears already to have conceived her plot for his death, for the curdled milk of the nomad tent which she set before him in the "lordly dish" was soporific in its effect as well as pleasant and refreshing. But Sisera had now made himself, not her guest, but her personal enemy; she would look upon this guile as one of the many deceptions that are used in war for misleading a foe; and in her less enlightened age would too readily regard it as a justifiable resource in a great crisis of life and death.

But whatever objections may be found with the details, the whole aspect of the perplexing tragedy is changed, and its leading difficulty removed, when Sisera is no longer thought of with pity as a hunted fugitive pleading for a place of rest in a friendly tribe, which he could as easily, though not so securely, have found in Heber's tent; but is seen in his true character as an ungodly and ruthless tyrant terminating his career of cruelty and oppression by a desperate and insolent violation of the sacredness of the domestic sanctuary.

On this ground it is that Deborah appears to rest her commendation of the wife of Heber. As our Lord rejoices in the singular faith of the Roman centurion, so the Hebrew prophetess extols the holy courage of the Kenite matron whom the Lord Himself so signally honoured by "delivering Sisera into her hand," and enabling her by faith to fight the half of the whole battle in that memorable day, and to overcome "in the power of His might." Deborah ascended Mount Tabor with Barak, she gave him the signal to go down into the plain where "the Lord had gone out before him," and she descended with him into

the field of battle, for she had given him the promise, "I will surely go with thee." After the defeat of Sisera's host, in Barak's pursuit of him to Kedesh, she would either "go with him" or follow him, for the prediction of Israel's victory was only half fulfilled so long as Sisera lived. In the tent of Jael she would learn for herself the details of his last hour of which she has recorded so vivid an account. The two noble women, Jew and Gentile, who had separately fought a good fight of faith on that great day and shared its chief honours between them, would now praise the Lord together and give all the glory of the day to Him alone. Jael would afterwards listen with holy joy and exultation to the lofty Song of Deborah and Barak, and would hear the voice of her own praise with holy shame and humility. But in that tribute to herself there is the distinctive praise which she would most of all desire, the distinction of being "*blessed above women in the tent.*" It is the violated sanctuary of her tent that has given her the right to take the life of "the mighty" for the help of the Lord; and on all that pertains to her tent, the milk, and the nail, and the mallet, the prophetess loves to dwell. For her weapons of war, in the strength of the Lord "she puts her hand to the nail, and her right hand to the workman's hammer," just as David afterwards took the sling and the stone, and both of them in faith of Israel's God giving the victory to them whom man despises.

"Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be, blessed shall she be above women in the tent," are words of praise to which some may have hesitated to say Amen so long as to them the wife of Heber was only like another Gentile woman, the inhabitant of a village or a city. But when the lofty tribute is rendered to her as numbered distinctively among "women in the tent," they will cordially concur in the commendation of her self-sacrificing faith and courage, of her disinterested love for



Israel, and of her fervent jealousy for Israel's God. In Deborah's singularly glorious Song in memory of Israel's battle at the foot of Mount Tabor, the divinely heroic deed of Jael fitly contributes to the fulness of its closing sentence: "So let all Thine enemies perish, O Lord: but let them that love Him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might."

A. MOODY STUART.

---

THOUGHTS.

MAN LIVETH NOT BY BREAD ALONE.

**I. Adam's brief life not by bread alone in Eden.**

—1. *The angels living by the word of God alone without bread.*—“He maketh His angels spirits”; and the highest of their heavenly host, those amongst them “that excel in strength,” live only by “hearkening to the voice of His word.” The prince of this world in his first estate lived by the word of God; but he kept not that word, for “His word is truth,” and “he abode not in the truth,” but became “a liar and the father of it.”

2. *The ox living by grass alone without the word of God.*—To the ox his Creator gave “every green herb for meat,” but without imparting the knowledge of his Maker, or capacity for acquiring it. The beast of the field was formed by the word of God, and sustained by His power; but with no command either what to eat or from what to abstain, with no consciousness of good or evil, of obedience, or transgression, and with no conception of the great Being to whom he owed his life. He ate the grass without sin and without holiness, and lived by grass alone without the word of God. As he was formed, so he liveth on from generation to generation to the world's end, “asking no questions.”

3. *Adam living by bread with the word of God.*—“In the image of God made He man,” and He made him for communion with Himself. He did not evolve him from any beast of the field after its likeness, but fashioned him in His own likeness, “a little lower than the angels”; leaving the ox utterly and for ever incapable of entering into the heart or the mind of man; but creating man capable at once of entering into His own thoughts, and of loving

and being consciously loved by the invisible God. From the day of man's creation he lived by bread, but not for one hour by bread alone without the word of God. Of every tree of the garden he might freely eat; but the liberty was by the Divine word in express permission, and in *so* eating man lived. Of one tree by the same word he was forbidden to eat, and by eating thereof he died. He sought to possess all the world of Eden for himself, apart from any permissive and subjecting word; and in gaining the whole world he lost his own soul, his higher and only true life, his friendship and fellowship with the living God, and became "dead in sin."

## II. Israel's chequered life not by bread alone in the wilderness.—1. *Israel redeemed from Egypt and day by day fed by the hand of God.*—One chief end of the forty years' travelling through the wilderness was to train Israel to know that

man doth not live by bread only, but by the word of God; showing us both how high a place this lesson takes in the Divine teaching, and how slow men are to learn it. Not forty days after Israel had been gathered at the foot of Mount Sinai, and had listened trembling to the Ten Commandments, "they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass"; so far were they from understanding that man lives by the word of the invisible God. During forty years thereafter they ate of "angels' food"; their life was angelic in so far as it hung day by day on the daily word of the Lord. That word gave them fresh bread day after day; and they were taught that their life was held in being not only by the visible bread, but by the word of the unseen God, who "gave them what they gathered, opening His hand and filling them with good."

2. *Ransomed men learning to live not by bread alone.*—As Israel redeemed out of Egypt were sensibly taught this great leading lesson, so every man that is ransomed through the blood of the Lamb from the chains of sin and Satan learns with surprise and delight that his earthly life no longer depends on bread alone, but on the word of the living God. When the three thousand converts at Pentecost were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, "they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." It was repentance unto life and deliverance from condemnation that had been granted them

from heaven; and they had no care "what they should eat or drink or wherewithal they should be clothed." But for the first time in their lives they had learned that man does not live by bread only, but by every word of God; the eating of their daily food became part of their higher and everlasting life; and receiving it from the hand of a reconciled Father, they lived not by bread alone, but by bread with the word of God that sanctified it to them. So our Lord teaches us to ask our daily bread from our Father in heaven. Yet in our house there is bread enough and to spare; we take it not as our own, but ask Him both to give and to bless it to us; and if the widow's barrel of meal is reduced to a single handful, and her cruse of oil to the last few drops, "the word of the Lord" can both preserve the meal from wasting and the oil from failing, and send to her a double portion of the bread "which endureth unto everlasting life."

**III. The Son of man's whole life on earth never by bread alone.**—With the first man Satan had succeeded too easily in tempting him to live by bread only, and if he could succeed a second time with the promised Seed of the woman, he would lead the whole human family captive at his will. Christ had been recognised from heaven as the beloved Son of the Father, the devils "knew" for themselves that He was "the Holy One of God"; and the tempter knew that in becoming man He had taken the form of a servant with unqualified obedience to the Father's will and constant dependence on the Father's care. If therefore he could persuade Him to make the attempt to live by bread alone, his conquest would be complete. In this Divine Man, Satan had a new element to grapple with; it was hopeless for him to contend directly with God's eternal Son and his own Creator; and his only hope seemed to be in persuading Jesus to turn aside from the position of a servant and use His Divine power for the relief of His own want.

When the time of His fast was now ended, the temptation seemed to suggest that it was both needless and unfitting for the Son of God to subject Himself to the gnawings of intense hunger, when by a single word He could turn into bread the stones which He had Himself made. Christ by His reply admits that His word would transform the stones into bread if He wished it so. For the sake of the otherwise fainting multitude of His hearers, He did

afterwards by His simple word convert the five barley loaves into bread for five thousand men; and like Israel of old, they lived for that day not by bread only, but by the word that proceeded from the mouth of the Lord. But in His own personal case, He answers Satan by reminding him that the eternal truth of His being the Son of God was now only one-half of the truth concerning Him, because he was now also the Son of man; and that being man He must live not by His own will, but by the will and the word of God. It was true indeed that if He converted the stone into bread for His own hunger, He would have turned it into food by His Divine word and power; but in so doing He would have thrown off the form of the Father's servant, and have marred all the work He had come to fulfil. That work was to obey and to suffer all the Father's will for our redemption; the veiled glory of His Godhead filling with infinite dignity and worth every act of obedience and every pang of sorrow and suffering on our behalf.

It has been supposed that the tempter's design was to induce our Lord to doubt His Divine Sonship. But as on the pinnacle of the temple the entrance of such a doubt into His thoughts would have effectually deterred Him from casting Himself down from the giddy height; so likewise in the desert the insinuated doubt, if successful, would have closed His lips from issuing the powerless command to the deaf stones. In the third temptation our Lord's indignant reply to the tempter's impious proposal, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him *only* shalt thou serve," seems to indicate that Satan asked Him to divide His service between God and mammon; as if in despair of persuading Him to lay aside the form of a servant, he now laid the whole world at His feet on condition of receiving a share of the service in which he had found Him so fixed to remain.

As in the opening of our Lord's ministry Satan tempted Him to use His Divine power for His own relief, so likewise at the close he renewed the temptation with bitter vehemence, through the lips of his willing servants, in the oft-repeated taunt, "Come down from the cross." And even as He could have called the stones to minister to His need, so He could have come down from the cross by His own power, but only by declining the dregs of the cup which the Father had given Him to drink. But as in the beginning, so in the end, in "the hour and power of darkness," the Prince of this world came, and found nothing in Him. The first

man, electing to live without and against the word of God, forfeited his own and our inheritance in Eden. The Second Man "glorified God in the earth," by living throughout His course, from His birth to His death, "by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God"; and having finished the work the Father had given Him to do, He gives Himself freely to us for eternal life. "I am the living Bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever."

A. M. S.

---

BREVIA.

**Note on the Word ναός in Ephesians ii. 21.**—Dr. Westcott in THE EXPOSITOR for August dwells (pp. 94, 95), on the distinction between *ιερόν* and *ναός*. The significance of the latter word in Ephesians ii. 21<sup>1</sup> (*πάσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὕξει εἰς ναὸν ἁγίον ἐν Κυρίῳ*) has not, so far as I know, been noticed. The Apostle may have in his mind the great temple of Artemis, he is certainly thinking of the temple at Jerusalem. In either case, the many *buildings* formed the *ιερον* (Matt. xxiv. 1, *τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*; Acts xix. 27, *τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερόν*). St. Paul therefore would naturally have written *πάσα οἰκοδομὴ . . . αὕξει εἰς ἱερόν*. But the unexpected substitution of *εἰς ναόν* is intentional and significant. St. Paul has prepared the way for it in v. 14 (*τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας*). In the spiritual reality of which he speaks there can be no distinction between outer and inner courts (Acts xxi. 29); degrees of consecration will be done away: the innermost shrine, the permanent abode of God, will be co-extensive with the whole temple. Compare Revelation xxi. 22.

The words so interpreted are strikingly illustrated by a passage of Josephus (*Antiq.* xi. 3), referred to in Archbishop Trench's *Synonyms*). The Samaritans requested to be allowed *συγκατασκευάσαι τὸν ναὸν καὶ κοινωνῆσαι τῆς οἰκοδομίας*. Zerubbabel and Joshua refuse, telling them that the building of the shrine is a charge laid on themselves, that the only privilege they could have was that common to all men, *ἀφικνουμένους εἰς τὸ ἱερόν σέβειν τὸν*

<sup>1</sup> On the translation "every building," see Bp. Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, ii., p. 65.



θεόν. In the whole narrative of Josephus a distinction is drawn between building the shrine and building the temple. Thus, *e.g.*, chap. 7: ἦνύετο κατὰ πολλὴν σπουδὴν ἢ κατασκευὴ τοῦ ναοῦ . . . ὑποδομήκεσαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ τὰς ἐκ κύκλῳ τοῦ ναοῦ στοὰς τοῦ ἑνδοθεν ἱεροῦ.

FRED. H. CHASE.

**Recent Books.**—Cardinal Newman defined Liberalism in religion as the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments, and maintained that the spirit of liberalism is “the characteristic of destined antichrist.” Mr. Roberts<sup>1</sup> denies that liberal Protestantism is anti-dogmatic, and that there is any anti-dogmatic party in the Church of England. “I am positively for dogma, and so, I am sure, is every Liberal Christian, because a man cannot be a Christian at all without explicitly or implicitly holding Christian dogma.” “The supreme aim of Liberalism in religion is to get more certain hold of positive truth, and that will be the foundation of dogmas which can fear no examination. . . . Authority has resulted in dead submission or in open rebellion. Free and capable investigation will result in a unity which cannot be broken.” Had these utterances been published thirty years ago as the manifesto of the Broad Church party, they would have prevented much misunderstanding. The leaders of the Liberal party in religion have too frequently conveyed the impression that they aimed at a comprehensive unity by enlarging and disguising the meaning of theological terms. Even in this volume there are evidences that Mr. Roberts has not stepped clear of this snare. The sermons on Revelation are unsatisfactory and will bring light to no mind. But if in one or two of the sermons there is apparent something like a shrinking from “the offence of the Cross,” the character of the volume as a whole is certainly outspoken and truthloving; and while there is less ascertainment of objective truth than the professed aim of the writer’s party would lead us to expect, there is much done to clear away subjective difficulties. The subjects dealt with are important; they are dealt with sincerely, seriously, and intelligently; and the bright and crisp style will commend the sermons to all readers.

MARCUS DODS.

<sup>1</sup> *Liberalism in Religion, and other Sermons.* By W. Page Roberts, M.A. (Smith, Elder & Co., 1886.)

Mr. Lloyd's *The Book of Joshua: a Critical and Expository Commentary on the Hebrew Text* (Hodder and Stoughton) is a most unsatisfactory compound of rather miscellaneous materials. How much might be done for the furtherance of critical Bible-study by country clergymen, if they only knew what was wanted, and which guides to follow! There is no greater *desideratum* than good grammatical notes on the chief books of the Old Testament, but Mr. Lloyd would have done better to wait for Dillmann's commentary. At the same time, I willingly admit that his Hebrew scholarship, though deficient in nicety, is sufficiently accurate for students in an early stage. But why give the misleading title, "A Critical Commentary"?

T. K. CHEYNE.

---

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL FROM THE STAND-  
POINT OF MODERN CRITICISM.

Two<sup>1</sup> members of the modern critical school have recently devoted special study to the history of Israel: Wellhausen, whose views of the composition and structure of the Pentateuch have already been presented in *THE EXPOSITOR*,<sup>2</sup> and Stade, whose writings have not yet been given to English readers in English dress. Wellhausen has exhibited only a sketch of his method of dealing with that history;<sup>3</sup> Stade has composed a detailed work,<sup>4</sup> in which the principles of the most advanced historico-critical school are fully illustrated.

We do not dispute for a moment the right of critics to subject the writings of the Old and New Testaments to the same tests as other historical records that have come down to us from a hoary antiquity. However ungrateful and unedifying the task may be, it does not beseem the Old Testament theologian who controverts the views of the

<sup>1</sup> We do not include Seinecke's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Göttingen, 1876-1884), because his work is not nearly as valuable, and he does not belong to the same school, although he is equally radical in some of his views. He complains of Wellhausen's treatment of him (Part ii., p. v.), who tells him: "Ist mir ganz einerlei, wollen Sie mein Schüler sein, so dürfen Sie auch nicht von mir abweichen," as follows: "He spoke in his wonted manner as a complete autocrat, and indeed at the same time when he was bitterly lamenting before me the despotism of the president of the parliament (*Reichstagspräsidiums*), who is honoured by all Germany."

<sup>2</sup> London, 1886, pp. 81-98.

<sup>3</sup> In his "Prolegomena" to the *History of Israel* (Edinburgh, 1885, pp. 427-548; reprinted from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*).

<sup>4</sup> Five numbers of this have appeared in Oncken's *Allgemeine Geschichte*, under the title "Geschichte des Volkes Israel": Berlin, 1881-1887. The last part brings the history down to the time of the exile.

critics to take refuge behind the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, openly or covertly. In the discussions of Pentateuch criticism, and the historicity of the Old Testament documents, he must lay aside an *à priori* view of the subject, and must choose an inductive method.

It is not our object to discuss the critical positions of Graf and Wellhausen, as set forth in a preceding article. We shall reserve our criticism of those views until after we have considered the history and theology of Israel from the standpoint of the modern critical school. And although our sympathies are strictly with those who hold conservative views on this subject, as that term is understood in England and America, yet we think that nothing can be gained by denying or belittling the force of those arguments which Wellhausen has presented with such power. The attitude of a judge rather than of an advocate is of the highest importance in such discussions. We believe that the Old Testament needs no apology, and no partisan defence, when viewed in the light of the age in which it was produced, and of the needs of the men for whom it was written.

Both Wellhausen and Stade agree that the history of Israel is essentially a religious history.<sup>1</sup> This, to our mind, really strikes the key-note of the whole discussion. Stade not merely gives the religion of Israel the position of one of the principal religions with Kuenen, but the first place.<sup>2</sup> It was the religion of Israel that made the history of Israel, and Stade admits that that religion and that history are of prime importance to mankind. To all this we agree.

But at the very next step we stand at the point where two ways diverge, until finally they run apart as far as heaven from earth. According to the critics of the modern school the religion of Israel is a natural development,<sup>3</sup> based

<sup>1</sup> Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," p. 433; Stade, *Geschichte*, p. 12: "The history of Israel is essentially a history of religious ideas."

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte*, p. 3 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 9.

on the principles set forth by Tylor,<sup>1</sup> Herbert Spencer, and others; according to our view it is the fruit of a Divine revelation, sown in a soil which had been infested with the weeds of barbarism and superstition, from which it was more or less cleared by Moses and the prophets,—not to mention other holy men,—in which the enemy of mankind, through the aid of heathen neighbours, sowed tares. The fruit would never have appeared in Israel's history if the seed had not been given by a Divine hand. The limitation and imperfection that we may see is due to the previous character of the soil and the presence of hostile neighbours. In the production of this Divine fruit we may trace progress, but not what the scientists mean by evolution.

We may compare the Christianity of to-day to a tree. Judging from its fruit, we say that it had a supernatural origin; but if trunk and branches are Divine, the tap-root found in ancient Israel must also be Divine. If it be true that Israel's religion made Israel's history, then we claim as a fundamental principle that this history must be different in kind from that of any other people on earth, and that the historical character of Old Testament narratives is not to be doubted because of the occurrence of miracles<sup>2</sup> and definite predictions in them.

From the standpoint of modern criticism the crises of Israel's history, which are signalized, according to Israel's historians, by supernatural displays of Divine power, are but chapters of happy accidents, or else are struck out as unworthy of credence. While Stade does not recognise any Egyptian bondage or any deliverance at the Red Sea, Wellhausen finds Israel, under a series of natural causes, de-

<sup>1</sup> Stade makes frequent references to Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, especially in his discussion of fetishism, animism, and totemism in Israel.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Stade, who says, *Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, p. 526, concerning 1 Kings xviii.: "Es ist bereits bemerkt worden, dass diese Erzählung schon wegen ihres Hanges zum Mirakel unhistorisch ist."



livered from Egyptian bondage,<sup>1</sup> safely transported across the Red Sea,<sup>2</sup> and finally settled in the land of Canaan.<sup>3</sup>

But there are certain crises in Israel's history, where the introduction of a supernatural power triumphing over the ordinary course of nature is necessary for their reasonable explanation. Indeed, in this respect the Old and New Testament dispensations are one. The new birth, the resurrection of Jesus, His immaculate conception, and the supernatural origin of Israel's religion fall under the same category. We are aware that other religions, besides those of Israel and of Christianity, lay claim to a supernatural origin; but none can furnish such proof, in their scriptures or in the lives of their followers, of their right to make such a claim.

We conclude therefore that Israel's religion was not the result of natural development, but of supernatural revelation, and that it is attended at certain periods by miraculous displays of God's power in the history; and we lay this down at the very beginning of our criticism of the recent construction of Israel's history as a cardinal pre-supposition.

We shall consider three points which we derive from the study of the modern theories of Israel's history:

I. The origin and course of Israel's history must have been subject to the same laws as those of other nations.<sup>4</sup>

II. It is impossible that the religion of Israel should have been produced all at once, as a complete whole, like Christianity.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "Prolegomena," p. 430.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 433.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 444.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, vol. ii., pp. 23, 24. (Chicago, 1884.) Stade, *Geschichte*, p. 397, finds important analogies between the tribal origin of the Bedouin of pre-Islamic times, the ancient populations of Italy and Greece, and that of Israel.

<sup>5</sup> Stade: *Geschichte*, p. 8. He says: "Das Christenthum trat in vollendeter Form nur deshalb auf, weil es . . . der Abschluss der alttestamentlichen Religion ist."

III. An examination of Israel's history gives evidence of a gradual progress from fetishism to monotheism.<sup>1</sup>

### I.

It is claimed that Israel's history in its origin is subject to the same laws as the histories of other nations of antiquity.<sup>2</sup> The story of the beginning of all other nations is mythical. No scholar any longer believes that Romulus and Remus were nourished by a wolf. The whole account is regarded simply as a specimen of a certain class of myths.<sup>3</sup> In the same way, except among scholars of strongly evangelical tendencies, it has become customary in Germany to regard a large part of the Pentateuch as mythical and legendary. The accounts of other nations begin with the stories of gods and heroes. Hence the theophanies (*e.g.* Gen. iii. 8 ff; iv. 6, etc.), the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men (Gen. vi. 1-4), and the stories told of giants and heroes (Gen. x. 8, 9; Num. xii. 28; Deut. iii. 11; Jud. xiii.-xvi.; 1 Sam. xvii.) are regarded as precisely the same mythical phenomena which are found in the earlier works of uncritical profane history.<sup>4</sup> Other peoples derive their national designation from a mythical ancestor or eponym hero, as the Dorians from Dorus, the Pelasgians from Pelasgus, etc. So, not to speak of the names of ancestors found in the tenth chapter of Genesis, which the critics regard mostly as those of countries and peoples, they not only deny all personality to Eber (Gen. xi. 14), but also to Israel. According to this theory, the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., at the best stand for typical men or tribes.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stade : *Geschichte*, pp. 9, 407, 429 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Martineau's preface to Ewald's *History of Israel*, vol. i., p. ix. f. (London, 1876.)

<sup>3</sup> Lenormant : *Beginnings of History*, p. 149. (New York, 1882.)

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 352-355.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Dillmann : *Die Genesis*, p. 155 ff. (Leipzig, 1882.)

The romance of Jacob's life dissolves into an unsubstantial myth. Esau, whose other name is Edom, is a Phœnician god. Leah, the less beloved wife of Jacob, is another name for the tribe of Levi. Even Joshua is merely the name of a clan.

It is furthermore affirmed that we are to interpret certain things in the sacred history by the peculiarities of Semitic peoples. Such are marriage, sonship, and genealogical tables. Marriage, in the accounts in Genesis, simply indicates the union of two tribes,<sup>1</sup> the stronger being represented by the husband, the weaker by the wife. Tribes of inferior importance, that become lost in another, appear as concubines. Thus, Sarah, Hagar, Keturah, Rebecca, Leah, Rachel, Bilhah, and Zilpah<sup>2</sup> do not designate women, but tribes. Moreover, when we see a priestly family traced back to Aaron, although it is distinctly stated that the father begat sons, and that they begat sons down to the remotest generation, we must not understand this literally, according to the critics, but simply as indicating membership in a guild, where blood relationship is neither meant nor indicated. Hence the whole system of genealogies, whether in Genesis or Chronicles, is rejected.

In like manner the descent of the twelve tribes from the twelve patriarchs is dismissed from the realm of sober reality. Stade declares that no people knows its own progenitor.<sup>3</sup> The Israelitish tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, Manasseh, etc., were not derived from progenitors of that name, but from a fusion of various elements,<sup>4</sup> which may subsequently have named themselves after some animal<sup>5</sup> which they regarded as their totem and at

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, Stade, and others.

<sup>2</sup> Stade: *Geschichte*, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 397.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 398.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 152-408. Cf. W. Robertson Smith: *Kinship and Marriage in Arabia*, p. 219 f. (Cambridge, 1885.)

the same time their god,<sup>1</sup> or may have ascribed their origin to some eponym hero.

There can be no doubt that in view of certain attested facts of scientific historical investigation, the theories of such critics as Stade and others regarding the mythical beginnings of Israel's history seem very plausible. But the difference between early Chaldæan and Egyptian myths and the accounts that we have in the first ten chapters of Genesis is very striking. In the one we are introduced to the region of the wildest extravagance; in the other, we find an antique beauty and simplicity which might well be Divine.

And certainly the fact that other nations represent their history as beginning with the activity of gods and demigods in human affairs does not prove that those parts of Israel's history which especially represent God as an immediate factor in the course of events are mythical. To arrive at this conclusion, we must first prove that God never does interpose in the affairs of men, and that He never had a chosen people.

If we compare the theophanies in the early history of heathen nations with those of the Old Testament, we shall see the infinite superiority of the biblical representations. Admitting, as we must, that these heathen theophanies never could have occurred, we do not thereby disprove that there are genuine theophanies in the Old Testament history. Moreover we may say, with reference to the heathen theophanies, that a profound truth underlies them, that God is deeply interested in the course of history, and may be expected to interpose when He sees fit.

Besides, we have the consistent representation all through the history, prophecy, and poetry of the Old and New Testaments, that God is a factor in history. This idea is not only expressed in the call of Abraham, the

<sup>1</sup> Stade: *Geschichte*, p. 409.

mission of Moses and Joshua, the office of Samuel and the prophets, but also in the chastisements which follow the people all through their history, until Jerusalem finally falls a prey to the Romans.

The question of genealogies affords more difficulty. There are names in the tenth chapter of Genesis which certainly seem, as Augustine has observed, like those of nations rather than men.<sup>1</sup> But when we reach the patriarchal history, the case is different. Much of New Testament theology is based on God's covenant with Abraham. The history of the people of redemption really begins with God's command to him to leave his home and his native land. We do not deny that there was a tribe of Abraham, perhaps consisting of a thousand persons,<sup>2</sup> but we hold that there must have been an individual called by that name with whom God made a covenant. The statement that he came from Ur of the Chaldees, that he dwelt for a time in Mesopotamia, that he tented in Canaan and visited Egypt, is entirely credible, as recent studies have shown; and in this way we have a good explanation of the strong resemblances, and yet radical differences, which we find between the Chaldæan Genesis and the Genesis of the Old Testament.

In the same way it is credible that there were twelve patriarchs, sons of Jacob, who were progenitors of the tribes of Israel. Modern criticism, as we have seen, asserts that there is no tribe that knows its progenitor. But American genealogical studies show that in the emigration that came from old England to the New World there were certain families which have attained large numbers. Thick volumes have been published, tracing the genealogy of some thousands of persons to a single progenitor.<sup>3</sup> These

<sup>1</sup> "Gentes non homines" (*De Civitate Dei*, xvii. 3).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Rawlinson: *The Story of Ancient Egypt*, p. 126. (New York and London, 1887.)

<sup>3</sup> Since writing the above, there has casually come to my notice a book,



persons, to be sure, are scattered throughout different States of the Union; but we may suppose, if there had been a reason for it, they might have been gathered together as the tribe of Hollister in one county or state. Besides, the theory of the critics in regard to the formation of tribes through the fusion of various elements is doubtless true to this extent, that the servants were gradually numbered with the tribes.<sup>1</sup> We must remember that the history of Israel was designed to produce a certain result, and that therefore God chose certain men as His instruments.

## II.

Stade affirms, as we have stated, that it is impossible that the religion of Israel should have been produced all at once as a complete whole, like Christianity or Mohammedanism. With others, he considers the analogy of other peoples, the critical rearrangement of the documents, and the time when these successive documents appear, as against it.

Undoubtedly the fact of a progressive revelation is too often overlooked in dealing with the Old Testament. But, whatever the experiences of other peoples may have been in painfully groping after the light of nature, we have in the introduction of Christianity by its Founder the best possible illustration of a point which may be urged against the school of naturalistic religious development.

It can be proved that essential Christianity is found in the person of Christ, who did not write a line that has come down to us, and in the writings of Paul. For this Christianity there was indeed a broad foundation in the

entitled, *The Hollister Family of America: Lieut. John Hollister, of Wethersfield, Conn., and his Descendants*. 805 pp. (Chicago, 1886.) In this volume 5,564 persons are traced to Lieut. John Hollister, who is supposed to have emigrated to America in the year 1642.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rawlinson: *Moses, his Life and Times*, pp. 1, 2. (London, 1887.)

Old Testament; but after all, to change the comparison, dead Judaism was as unlike spiritual Christianity, as the dry cocoon is unlike the gorgeous butterfly. Christianity began with a miracle, which was the centre of Paul's teaching and writing,—the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

If we cut away the patriarchal history, which is based on God's covenant with Abraham, and strike out the residence in Egypt,<sup>1</sup> we certainly remove the ground of Mosaism as a completed system. But if we take the patriarchal history of the Pentateuch as it stands, we have a foundation for the spiritual side of Mosaism, and in the connexion of Israel and their leader with Egypt we may find a further basis for the legal and ritualistic<sup>2</sup> side of Mosaism.

Israel was born as a people, when it crossed the Red Sea under God's special guidance. Its laws were determined by the personality of Moses<sup>3</sup> and the needs of the times, although they were divinely communicated to him. There seems to be no reason for questioning that Mosaism in its essential elements was as truly a finished creation from the hands of Moses, as Christianity was through Christ and His servant the Apostle Paul.

The argument from analogy with regard to the gradual development of Israel's religion from the time of Moses can only be valid if Israel stands on the same plane as other peoples. But the claim of the entire Bible, which is

<sup>1</sup> Stade: *Geschichte*, p. 127 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," p. 440, admits that this is not inconceivable.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *The Old Testament Student*, p. 154 (Chicago, 1887), which gives the following quotation from De Wette: "A law of experience, that is valid in all history, is this, that all great discoveries, creations, and institutions in human life, even if they are based in the susceptibility, longing, and need of the masses, still always belong to the activity of superior individuals. Certain general movements, like the Reformation, the French Revolution, may be referred to the masses, the age, the nation, or the corporation, but the decisive moments in them can be ascribed only to certain individuals."

enforced by the whole history of Christianity as compared with other religions, is that it does not. We must presuppose a cause that accounts for certain effects. Human progress is not sufficient to account for the regenerating power of evangelical Christianity. We must rather see in the history of Israel the same Divine Spirit who has manifested Himself at the most important periods of the Church's history.

Undoubtedly the strongest arguments of the critics for the gradual development of Israel's religion from a very rudimentary stage are found in their rearrangement of the documents, and in the dates that they assign to them.<sup>1</sup> If we accept this rearrangement and these dates as substantially correct, it is difficult to see how we can avoid accepting their construction of Israel's history and their conclusions regarding the origin and growth of Israel's religion.

For us the strength of this theory is in the close relation of two of the codes to certain facts of prophetic literature. While the writings of Jeremiah seem to be saturated with Deuteronomy, and the last chapters of Ezekiel with Leviticus (xvii.-xxvi.), the older prophets, except possibly Joel, who is now held to be post-exilic, afford a very questionable evidence of familiarity with the writings of the Pentateuch. It is therefore a legitimate question why our Pentateuch, if it existed before the most ancient prophets, should not have made more of an impression on their writings?

There seem to us to be different documents in the Pentateuch, and these may easily be arranged as we have seen, so as to mark the stages in a development. Moreover the remaining literature of Israel may be harmoniously grouped around them by accepting the analysis of the

<sup>1</sup> For these see Wellhausen's *Theory of the Pentateuch*, in *THE EXPOSITOR*, p. 85 ff. (London, 1886.)

critics, after the excision of certain priestly elements from Judges,<sup>1</sup> Samuel,<sup>2</sup> and Kings.<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand, sober criticism accepts the residence in Egypt and the Exodus as fixed facts.<sup>4</sup> It seems to us that this admission demands a different theory concerning Israel's history, literature, and religion from that of the critics.

Starting with the traditional view that Abraham and the patriarchs had a knowledge of the true God, we must still remember that they lived in a superstitious age,<sup>5</sup> that their ancestors had been idolaters (Josh. xxiv. 14, 15), that there was idolatry in the family of Jacob (Gen. xxxi. 19, xxxv. 4), that Joseph married the daughter of an idolater (Gen. xli. 45), that they were among a nation of idolaters in Egypt,<sup>6</sup> where we are not surprised to learn, considering their antecedents and surroundings, that they practised idolatry (Josh. xxiv. 14; Ezek. xx. 7, 8, xxiii. 3).

It is probable that the most spiritual part of Israel never lost all knowledge of the true God. But in the midst of hard servitude, and a phenomenal increase in the population, which involved early marriages and a constant struggle for existence, we may well believe that the mass of the people sank lower and lower in superstition during the four hundred and thirty years of their residence in Egypt, although the promises to the patriarchs doubtless remained

<sup>1</sup> Stade, *Geschichte*, p. 71, characterizes Jud. xix.-xxi. as a "tendency-programme," which is fully in accord with the *Grundchrift*. Cf. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," p. 237, who does not assign it as late a date as the priests' code, with the exception of one reference to "the congregation of the children of Israel," and the mention of Phineas.

<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," p. 256, says that 1 Sam. vii., viii., x. 17 *seq.*, xii., betray a close relationship with Jud. xix.-xxi.

<sup>3</sup> In 1 Kings vi.-viii. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," p. 280, says we meet with signs of the influence of the priestly code, especially in the Massoretic text.

<sup>4</sup> Wellhausen: "Prolegomena," pp. 429, 430.

<sup>5</sup> Ur of the Chaldees was the seat of the worship of the moon-god. See Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, p. 130. (Giessen, 1883.)

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Rawlinson, *The Story of Ancient Egypt*, p. 30 ff.

as a precious possession in the hearts of such people as the parents of Moses<sup>1</sup> and Aaron.

Was this then a fruitful soil to foster and develop the germinal thoughts regarding Jehovah planted by Moses simply by a process of natural development?<sup>2</sup> Could anything short of the ten plagues, the great deliverance at the Red Sea, the law mediated by Moses on Mount Sinai, and the miraculous sustenance of Israel, have made a sufficiently powerful impression on a people with such antecedents as to account for Mosaism and Israel's subsequent history?

It is objected however, that it is amazing that a revelation like that given in our Pentateuch should have been so long neglected and seemingly forgotten?

But does not the history of the Church in all ages show how easily pagan superstitions are grafted upon a pure faith until they almost choke it out?

What more was to be expected of Israel, which during the life of Moses gave such evidence of a tendency to apostatize, than that, after his death and that of Joshua, they should live as though there were no written Torah, surrounded as they were by heathen neighbours, who were only partially conquered, with whom they had constantly to contend for the maintenance of their new seats, without national unity, and doubtless with a corrupt priesthood?<sup>3</sup>

It may further be objected, that it is strange that such servants of God as Samuel, David, and the prophets should not have quoted the Torah, and lived more in accordance with its precepts. But at a time when the will of God was sought from the priests and prophets, no Scripture

<sup>1</sup> There seems to be a recognition of the true God in the name of Jochebed (Exod. vi. 20).

<sup>2</sup> Stade, *Geschichte*, p. 130, says, "Like all founders of religion, he brought his people a new creative idea, transforming their lives." He does not consider this idea original with him, but thinks that he derived it from the Kenites (p. 131).

<sup>3</sup> 1 Sam. ii. 12.



could have such power as the living word of God. It was not until the prophetic voices were hushed, and a priest no longer arose with Urim and Thummim,<sup>1</sup> that the law could take such a prominent position as it occupied after the exile.

The Torah was certainly a much rarer book in the time of Josiah than the Bible was when Luther was a monk at Erfurt. It is doubtful whether any private individual possessed a copy of it before the exile. Before the time of Josiah the book of Deuteronomy, or "people's book," had long since ceased to be read in public (2 Kings xxiii. 2, 3).<sup>2</sup> The ritual contained in the priests' code was for the information of the priests (Hag. ii. 11, Mal. ii. 7); but it is easy to see from the analogy of the history of the Romish Church how they might at least partially, and during some periods wholly, neglect this source of instruction and follow a tradition of their own, for we must remember that what they believed to be God's word to them must have seemed as binding as God's word to Moses.

Under such circumstances, is it very strange that the older prophets do not manifest any clear familiarity with the individual precepts of Moses, until Jeremiah, who lived in the age of Josiah, and Ezekiel, who was a priest as well as a prophet, and whose prophecies in the last chapters of his book were concerned with the same subjects as those found in Leviticus? Was it not rather to be expected that a "thus saith the Lord" would have even more weight with them than "the Lord said unto Moses"?

Why is it not conceivable that the book of the law may have been neglected and practically lost, as the precious Sinaitic manuscript was in the monastery of St. Catherine? And yet the law has left its impress on

Ezra ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65.

<sup>2</sup> The command that it should be read once in seven years is found in Deut. xxxi. 10-13.

Hebrew history, prophecy, and psalmody, in just such a way as we might expect, if such a view regarding the neglect and final loss of the law be correct. We are aware that all passages in the historical books, in the psalms and prophets, which have any connexion with the spirit of the priesthood as exhibited in the middle books of the Pentateuch are assigned to a post-exilic date. This of course is a necessity for the critics, with their theories concerning the origin and composition of the Pentateuch.

It seems therefore that there is nothing inherently improbable in the supposition that such parts of the Pentateuch as are assigned to Moses were committed to writing by him. Granted that he was an adopted son of a princess in the time of Ramses II., and we have no difficulty in supposing that he was sufficiently acquainted with the Phœnico-Hebrew language<sup>1</sup> to write a Torah for his people; and if we are to accept the historical accounts of the Pentateuch concerning him, even as substantially correct, as Wellhausen does,<sup>2</sup> we see that he had the motive to give his people a code at the beginning of their history.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rawlinson, *Moses, his Life and Times*, pp. 30, 31 (London, 1887), who says: "As all educated Romans in the days of Cicero learnt Greek, and all Russians in the time of Alexander I. were taught French, so all educated Egyptians had to be familiar with a Semitic dialect, which, if not exactly Hebrew, was at any rate closely akin to it." As a confirmation of this cf. Brugsch, *Geschichte Aegypten's unter den Pharaonen*, p. 552 (Leipzig, 1877): "Die Briefe und Urkunden aus den Zeiten der Ramessiden strotzen von semitischer Wörter-Einfuhr und stehen in dieser Beziehung kaum der deutschen Schrifte sprache nach, deren Schönheit und Kraft durch ausländische Lehnwörter so häufig herabgenüreligt wird." In each case the corruption of the language arose from a similar cause, that of the German through the constant use of French, as in the time of Frederick the Great, and that of the Egyptian through the use of the Phœnician in the time of the Ramses.

<sup>2</sup> "Prolegomena," p. 433: "But within the Pentateuch itself also the *historical* tradition about Moses (which admits of being distinguished, and must be carefully separated from the *legislative*, although the latter often clothes itself in a narrative form) is in its main features manifestly trustworthy, and can only be explained as resting on actual facts."

<sup>3</sup> The motive was in the need of a new nation, in the consciousness of his pre-eminent fitness, and in the call of God to this work. We have every reason to believe that the life of the people of Israel had as distinct a beginning

With such a people as Israel, and such a history as theirs, with God still speaking to priests and prophets in later times with as much authority as He did to Moses, it is credible that at least the essence of the Pentateuch existed in the time of Moses, that it was observed as long as Joshua lived and the elders who survived him (Jud. ii. 7, 10), but that it was greatly neglected, except perhaps in the time of David (Neh. ix. 26-34) until Deuteronomy came into prominence in the time of Josiah as the book for the times (2 Kings xxii. 8-xxiii. 25), and the priestly portions received special emphasis in the time of Ezra. Then it was that the prophet, who uttered God's living word to the people, had ceased to speak, and that the scribe, who could reproduce God's written word, came into special prominence.

The critical dates assigned to various Old Testament documents, which mark the Song of Deborah as the oldest historical source, and the work of the Jahvist as a product of the middle of the ninth century B.C., but which remand the bulk of Old Testament literature to a period subsequent to the exile, seem partially to confound the time when the Old Testament books were gathered together and edited with the date of their original composition.

Are we to believe that at an age when Egypt, Assyria, Phœnicia, and the land of the Hittites possessed an extensive literature,<sup>1</sup> that the time of David and Solomon,<sup>2</sup>

as that of the American colonies in the Declaration of Independence, and that the Torah of Moses had to some extent as much of a background in the history of the patriarchs and Egyptian civilization as the American constitution had in British law and history.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. i., pp. 237, 238. (Stuttgart, 1884.)

<sup>2</sup> It is an established fact that at this period Assyria was in a state of decline. Tiele, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*, vol. i., p. 167 (Gotha, 1886), says: "Man hat schon die Bemerkung gemacht, dass diese zeitweilige Ohnmacht der grossen Geisel Westasiens den Königen David und Salomo Gelegenheit gab, ein mächtiges und blühendes Reich zu gründen und im Stande zu halten." Cf. especially Rawlinson, *The Story of Ancient Egypt*, p. 295 (New York and

which was the most splendid period of Israelitish history, produced nothing that has come down to us?

Why when the Israelitish mind was fructified by contact with foreign nations under Solomon should there be no literature, and why should the obscure age between Ezra and the Machabees,<sup>1</sup> which saw the death of prophecy and the disappointment of so many national hopes, be so fruitful?

There is certainly no good reason for such a supposition, except in the necessities of the critics' theories, in a forced construction of Israel's history and of Israel's religious development.

### III.

The principle of development in Israel's history, as set forth by the modern critics, finds further illustration in the history of Israel's religion. Four stages are marked: fetishism, polytheism, monolatry, and monotheism.

Evidences of fetishism are seen in the naming of certain tribes after animals,<sup>2</sup> in the worship of ancestors,<sup>3</sup> of stones,<sup>4</sup> pillars, sacred trees, in their psychology<sup>5</sup> and in the current doctrine concerning the future state in sheol.<sup>6</sup>

Monolatry<sup>7</sup> is the worship of one God simply as the God of Israel, who stands on the same plane in the people's minds as Chemosh with the Moabites and Milcom with the Ammonites.

London, 1887): "In the latter half of the eleventh century . . . David began that series of conquests by which he gradually built up an empire, uniting in one all the countries and tribes between the river of Egypt (Wady-el-Arish) and the Euphrates. Egypt made no attempt to interfere with his proceedings, and Assyria after one defeat (1 Chron. xix. 16-19), withdrew from the contest."

<sup>1</sup> I presume to adopt this spelling on the basis of my dissertation, *The Name Mache Dee* (Leipzig, 1876).

<sup>2</sup> Stade: *Geschichte*, p. 407.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 391, 392, 394, 406.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 448, 457.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 418.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 424, 425, more properly of a continued state in sheol.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 429, 507.

While we must doubtless admit that fetishism and monolatry existed in Israel as well as polytheism, it does not follow from this that they constituted regular steps in a development; indeed Stade himself hardly seems to claim this.

It is not our object to enter into details in regard to the evidences of fetishism in Israel. Whether when Jacob raised the stone as a *maḥṣēbāh* which he had used as a pillow, poured oil upon it, and said it should be a *bēth-ʾēlohîm* (Gen. xxviii. 22), he in some superstitious way associated the idea of God's presence in it or with it, we do not know. In any case, we do not believe that he had truly spiritual conceptions of God in an age when fetishism was not uncommon. Certainly the fact that, at a later period, he buried the strange gods and earrings of his family (Gen. xxxv. 5),<sup>1</sup> would seem to indicate that he may have had higher conceptions of deity than at an earlier period.

Even if it should appear that certain views of the patriarchs and prophets are tinged with animism, especially in their views of a future state, what of it? We have no indication in the Pentateuch or prophets that God had made any revelation of the future state. It was Christ who shed clear light on this dark subject. The imperfect views of Old Testament saints regarding God and the future life are the result, at least in part, of the age in which they lived.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stade, p. 129, says, "Rings, amulets, etc., are used as fetish."

<sup>2</sup> It is clear not only that God does not give a full revelation of Himself in the Old Testament, but also that He allows views of Himself and of the future life which are imperfect, or even erroneous, to remain, until the set time for a more complete revelation. We learn from the New Testament that He does not approve of polygamy, slavery, and concubinage; but in the Old Testament these things are allowed without direct or even indirect reproof. In the same way there are some views of God and of the future life indicated in the Old Testament which in New Testament light seem to be imperfect and at times erroneous.



If all that the critics assert with regard to the presence of fetishism, polytheism, and monolatry in Israel were to be established, still it remains that the so called Jahvism, which they claim was introduced by Moses, is something more than a stage in a development. Even according to the theory of the modern critics it is a new idea, which, although at times obscured, finally overcomes both fetishism and polytheism, and lays the foundation of the monotheism of the prophets.

But if this be so, why should it not be the one great idea of the God of all the earth, who alone is to be worshipped as set forth in the ten commandments?

This idea, if we accept the testimony of Scripture divinely revealed to Moses, shone forth like the sun among the mists and fogs of low-lying meadows at the beginning of Israel's history. At other times it seems to have been almost entirely obscured by clouds; until, after the exile, it burst in undimmed splendour upon the Jewish world.

We conclude therefore, that Israel's religion and Israel's history, while conditioned by human development, are not a result of it, but of the power of God working through human instrumentalities to provide a people of redemption, through whom the written and incarnate Word should be given to man.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

---

### THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

PROFESSOR SALMON, in the interesting paper contributed by him to THE EXPOSITOR of last July, begins by saying, that "speculations concerning the origin of the Christian ministry have for him only a historical interest"; and he grounds this statement upon the consideration that, just

as conclusions at which the student may arrive respecting the origin of parliaments are not likely to affect in any way his allegiance to the now settled constitution of his country, so "the duty on the part of the individual to submit to the settled constitution of the Church is not affected, whatever be the true history of the process by which, in God's providence, the constitution of the Church was established. In any case," he adds, "it is a sin to rend Christ's body by causeless schisms." There is a sense in which these words are wise. Yet there is another in which the Professor would probably himself allow that the interest and importance attaching to such inquiries are far deeper than historical. Conflicting views upon them lie at the bottom of much of that alienation, and irritation of spirit towards one another, which mark the different branches of the Church of Christ in our land. The different opinions entertained upon the points at issue, together with the conclusions to which those who hold them feel themselves impelled, do almost more than anything else that can be named to "rend Christ's body." The most sacred feelings are wounded, the most conscientious convictions are shocked, by the harsh language used, to say nothing of harsh judgments passed, by many who persuade themselves that they, and they alone, faithfully obey the revealed will of Christ. All the melancholy consequences of disunion among Christians, upon which this is not the time or place to enter, immediately appear; and the Church of Christ is hindered from showing herself to the world as the living and visible expression of the living Lord, whose power now, as it was when He was upon earth, is love. To meet the lamentable state of matters around us, the first thing needed is inquiry into the points that lead to this separation of heart and action. Other things may be so far useful. Undenominational societies, Evangelical Alliances, addresses upon the value of unity, and common prayer that unity may be

realized, do this much at least, that they keep the subject before the minds of men. But these expedients will never of themselves cure the evils against which they are directed. Inquiry is what is wanted, calm, patient, and persistent, until we either reach some conclusion that shall obtain general acceptance, or are satisfied that, from the want of materials for judgment, no definite conclusion is possible. Notwithstanding all therefore that has been written upon the origin of the Christian ministry during the past year, it cannot be said that too much has been written. The subject has a most practical and living interest whenever it is looked at from the point of view now spoken of. The results reached may not, at least they may not immediately, affect individual positions in the Church of Christ, but they may affect in a powerful degree the attitude to one another of the different branches of that Church. It is on this ground only that, notwithstanding the obscurity and difficulty of the subject, I venture to add my contribution to its discussion.

In doing so it may be well to select some passage of a writer, near at least to the time of which we have to speak, that is in itself sufficiently clear upon the points under discussion; to determine the conclusions to which we are led either by it or by cognate passages from the same pen; and then to ask how far these conclusions help us to interpret more doubtful statements of other writers. For this purpose we select Clement of Rome, whose early date (not later than the last decade of the first century), high position, historical spirit, and special call to settle controversies arising out of questions of Church-government, recommend him as a peculiarly intelligent and suitable witness. In chap. xlv. of his first Epistle to the Corinthians we meet the well-known words which may be quoted in the original. *Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν*, he says, *ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἕρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς.*

Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομήν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν . . . τούτους . . . μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι, κ.τ.λ. There are in this passage two various readings that may be noticed. For *δεδώκασιν* the MS. to which Lightfoot has given the designation of C reads *ἔδωκαν*; but the general tendency of that MS. to make readings smoother, the natural disposition of scribes to follow up the verb *κατέστησαν* by a verb in a similar tense, and the greater difficulty of the first of the two readings mentioned, determine in favour of the latter. It is retained by Lightfoot. Gebhardt and Harnack read *ἔδωκαν*.

The second word *ἐπινομήν* is more important, and the difficulty of translating it has led to many conjectures. A full account of these will be found in Lightfoot's Appendix to his edition of St. Clement of Rome (p. 435), and in his note on the passage itself; but, with the exception of one, they are all justly rejected by him, as either inappropriate, or as diverging too widely from the MS. The single exception is the reading *ἐπιμονήν*, which he introduces into his text of the epistle, and which he understands in the sense of "permanence," translating (p. 368), "and afterwards they provided a continuance." The reading however rests purely on conjecture; and, although it has been adopted by other distinguished scholars, it is exposed to the fatal objection that, while designed to give certainty to the sense, its own meaning is as uncertain as that of the word which it supplants. It is unnecessary however to discuss the question, as the object we have in view is after all but little affected by it; and in these circumstances it seems better to retain the common reading *ἐπινομήν*. Nor is it difficult to find a fair enough meaning for that

word. Liddell and Scott quote Plutarch, in the present instance a more than usually valuable authority, as using the verb ἐπιεμεῖν in the sense "to feed over the boundaries"; and, with Stephanus, they assign to the substantive the meaning of "a grazing over the boundaries." The word may thus mean, an additional charge, a charge beyond that originally given. The Apostles gave directions, first, that one step, and then, secondly, that another should be taken. Rothe's idea, though somewhat akin to this, that the word means a "codicil," an "addition to a will or testament," is rather too far-fetched and too artificial to be easily accepted.

From the readings we turn to the interpretation, the most interesting question connected with which is, What is the subject of *κοιμηθῶσιν*? Is it the Apostles, or those who are described as the *τοῦς προειρημένους*? Most commonly it is answered, The latter: and the object of Clement is then to say, that the Church was not to be left at any time without a definite provision for the nourishment of her spiritual life, but that there should be always a succession of approved men in the ministry. The point is difficult of decision; yet it appears to be upon the whole more natural to suppose that the persons spoken of are the Apostles. In the first place, the *ἐὰν* preceding *κοιμηθῶσιν* is almost of itself inconsistent with any other supposition. Is Clement speaking of the first generation of presbyters appointed by the Apostles? Why does he say, "If they die?" He ought surely to have said, "When they die." There could be no doubt that they would die, and that successors would be needed. Why then speak in this conditional and uncertain manner? or why interpose an unnecessary clause, one implied in that *διά* of the *διαδέξωνται* immediately following which includes in itself the idea of succession? On the other hand, let us take the Apostles as the subject, and the *ἐὰν* has a distinct



meaning. "It glances at the contingency of the Apostles dying before the presbyters whom they had ordained;—a contingency in the view of which they made provision that others should succeed to their own power of ordaining presbyters."<sup>1</sup> Their position was this: in order that peace might be maintained in the Church, an authoritative succession must be preserved in the ministry. The Apostles had so far provided for this by their first appointments; and, were they to outlive these, they would have done the same thing again. But they might die, and therefore it was needful that they should entrust a further commission, a further work (*ἐπινομήν*), than would otherwise have been required, to those whom they first appointed. This work was to nominate with the consent of the Church, and to set apart to their office, persons who should be successors to themselves. In the second place, if the first generation of presbyters be the subject of the verb we should expect *οὗτοι* in the text as the nominative to *κοιμηθῶσιν*. The Apostles are the subject of all the previous verbs in the sentence, and it is natural for us to keep them in our minds to the close, unless a word be inserted to divert our thoughts to others. So natural is this, that Lightfoot, who adopts the reference, not to the Apostles, but to those appointed by the Apostles, is insensibly led to insert the word "these" in his translation,—“that if these should fall asleep.”<sup>2</sup> In the third place, the time of *διαδέξωνται* seems to follow that of *ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν*; but this cannot be the case if those referred to in this last expression be the first generation of Church officers by which the second generation is ordained. That first generation must ordain its successors before it dies, and the time of *διαδέξωνται* must precede, instead of following, the falling asleep that will be in Clement's eye. The only way, in con-

<sup>1</sup> Liddon: *A Father in Christ*. Second edition, Appendix.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Clement*, Appendix, p. 368.

sequence, by which due sequence and sense can be preserved on the supposition we are combating is that suggested by Dr. Donaldson when he says, "I conjecture that Clemens means that the Apostles made a second choice of men, in order that if the first should die there would be others ready to take their place."<sup>1</sup> But to this it may be replied that the making such a second choice of men is not only highly improbable (the Apostles might almost as well have made a third), it is inconsistent with the whole strain of the argument in chaps. xlii.-xliv. Succession through the commission of one immediately preceding and authorized to give it, is the point on which Clement dwells. God sends Christ; Christ sends Apostles; Apostles send approved men; and the proper sequence to this is that these approved men send in their turn others, whom they know to be approved. In the fourth place, the next following sentence confirms the rendering now given. The *ἐκείνων* in it is not the Apostles. We could hardly indeed suppose the rights of persons directly appointed by Apostles disputed in the Church. The word refers to the first generation of ministers who had been appointed by Apostles, *i.e.* to the *τοὺς προειρημένους* already spoken of; while the *ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν* are the second generation who had been, with the Church's approbation, appointed by the first, and who are thus the same as the *ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι* of the preceding sentence. The difference between the two descriptions seems to be that, in the former, we think more of good repute amongst men; in the latter, of the approbation and attestation of the Spirit (comp. chap. xlii.).

With these remarks we may translate the passage as follows: "And our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife in the matter of the bishop's office. For this cause therefore, having a perfect foreknowledge, they appointed those of whom I have pre-

<sup>1</sup> *Apostolic Fathers*, ed. of 1874, p. 172.

viously spoken, and afterwards have given them a further commission, in order that, if they should fall asleep, other approved men should receive in succession the ministration which they had performed. Those therefore that were appointed by them (the such as were previously spoken of), or afterwards by men held in high repute, etc. . . . For it will be no small sin on our part if we remove those who have blamelessly and holily offered the gifts of the bishop's office. Blessed are the presbyters who have gone before, . . . for they have no fear that any one should remove them from the place assured to them."

Let us now consider the inferences suggested by this passage, comparing with it at the same time the other passages of Clement's epistle that bear upon the point.

1. Those spoken of are styled the *προειρημένοι*, and there can be no doubt that we are thus referred back to chap. xlii., in which we read that the Apostles, "preaching everywhere in country and town, appointed their firstfruits, when they had approved of them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of them that should believe." Two classes of office-bearers seem to be distinctly mentioned here. The quotation from the Old Testament by which the statement is followed, and of which it is given as an illustration, implies this; and the conclusion is confirmed by the opening sentences of the chapter, in which we have one of the clearest statements of the epistle, with regard both to the whole scheme of God's arrangements for His Church and the principle upon which it rests; all things were to be done *εὐτάκτως*; and, after God and Christ, the *τάξις* was—Apostles, bishops, deacons! In the "bishops and deacons" therefore we seem to have certainly two orders and not simply one.

2. As to the relation between the bishops and deacons nothing is distinctly said. Mention of the latter is even at times wholly dropped, as in the beginning of chap. xliv.,

where we are told, that the disputes were about the ἐπισκοπή,<sup>1</sup> although deacons not less than bishops must be included in the immediately following προειρημένους. The best explanation of this, or even of the fact that the disputes at Corinth were confined to the "bishopric," seems to be that the deacons did not occupy so much a separate office, as the position of assistants to the bishop. By such a view we can understand the fact that they are so often passed over in silence when we should expect them to be mentioned; while at the same time it is easy to conceive that they should grow, even rapidly, in importance until they became a distinct grade of officers of the Church. Thus too we can trace a distinct principle ruling the procedure of the Apostles. They had early got assistants to themselves appointed (Acts vi. 1, etc.); and, having found by experience the value of that arrangement, they were led, when appointing persons to take their own place in Churches over which they could not personally preside, to appoint also other persons who might be assistants to

<sup>1</sup> May it not be possible to explain in this way that use of the word ἀρχιερεύς in chap. xl., which has occasioned so much discussion? The argument there is from the analogy of the institutions of the Old Testament, and the analogy must hold. When therefore it is drawn out into so many particulars, the natural inference is that it is meant to apply, not merely to a general principle of order and subordination, but to the several details. The "high priest" spoken of however can hardly be a single officer at the head of the congregation, for such an application of the word is wholly unknown not only to Clement but to his time, and does not meet us till the days of Tertullian and Cyprian. Nor can Christ Himself be the High Priest, for the latter not less than the others mentioned is to follow the precepts of the Master that he may not go wrong. May the officer of the Christian Church analogous to the high priest of old not be the Apostle who was the founder of any particular Church and the supreme earthly power connected with it? With this idea the language of Polykrates may be compared, when he calls St. John a priest who wore the πέταλον, or sacerdotal plate (Euseb., *H. E.* v. 24). Polykrates, though writing late in the second century, may refer to the more than half-century, the "sixty-five" years before, which in the same letter he tells us he remembers. The same result is obtained if, instead of thinking of the Apostles as the high priests, we find their *analogon* in the prophets of the early Church. To this the *Didaché* would lead us: "For they (the prophets) are your high priests" (chap. xiii. 3).

them. When therefore we speak, as we have spoken, of two classes of officers appointed by the Apostles in the early Church, it would be probably more true to the actual history of the case to speak only of one such class. There was at first only one apostolically appointed order of men to which, in a *supreme* sense, was committed the task of guiding the congregation, administering the sacraments, exercising discipline, presiding as shepherds over the flock, and setting apart and commissioning their successors—in short, doing all those things for the maintenance and welfare of the Church which the Apostles would themselves have done had they possessed the gifts of ubiquity and immortality. These were the “bishops.” The “deacons” were, properly speaking, not another order: they were assistants to the first.

3. We come now to a much more difficult point,—the relation between these “bishops and deacons,” on the one hand, and those, on the other hand, who are styled “presbyters.” Of these last Clement makes frequent mention in his epistle, and that in a way which shows that the designation properly belonged to the “bishops,” if not also to the “deacons.” Thus, in chap. xlv., we have already found him saying, at the moment when he contrasts those thrust out of the bishop’s office upon earth with those who, having reached the heavenly rest, could no more experience such a fate, “Blessed are those presbyters,” etc. They who were the bishops spoken of must also have been presbyters. Again in chap. xlvii. it is said that the ancient Church of Corinth was revolting against “the presbyters.” Again in chap. liv., obviously referring to the “bishops,” Clement exhorts the Corinthian Church to be “at peace with its appointed presbyters,” where the same word is used for “appointed,” as had been used in chaps. xlii. and xlv. for appointing bishops and deacons.

A glance at these passages is sufficient to show that the



“bishops,” if not also the “deacons,” of Clement’s epistle were also “presbyters.” Yet this last term cannot denote *official* position in the Church ; for, whenever Clement deals distinctly with differing grades of office (understanding the diaconate to be such a grade), he speaks of “bishops and deacons,” and of them alone. How are we to explain this ? Let us call to mind two facts : (1) that, as universally allowed, “presbyters” had long been known to the Jews as persons entrusted with the care of their religious ordinances, and (2) that the true interpretation of a word is supplied to us when we know the idea which it would suggest to the minds of those who used it. Let us further remember that the theory which makes “bishops” and “presbyters” synonymous is a mere method of escaping a difficulty, and we seem to have some ground for saying that in the present instance when, not yet rid of old ideas, the Christian Church was making her own organization clear to herself, she was extremely likely to use the word “presbyters” as a *general* term to express religious officers. To her the force of the word may have been similar to that belonging to our day to the use of the word *Reverend*.<sup>1</sup> If an English word may be coined for the purpose, the presbyters of the Jewish congregations were the “reverends,” the “clerics,” of the Church. The name “presbyter” might thus be used by Christians with a double meaning. It might signify officers discharging particular duties in the congregation ; but it might also express the general idea of office-bearing ; and, in the latter sense, bishops and deacons would be *πρεσβύτεροι* not less than the official presbyters. Looking at the word in this light we can without difficulty understand how Clement might apply it to his bishops and

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Salmon, in the article already referred to, says, “It must be remembered that ‘elder’ was, not only the name of a Church office, but also a title of honour. It is used, for instance, by Papias, in speaking of the Apostles and other men of the first generation of Christians, much as we might speak of ‘the Fathers’” (p. 7). “On that hint I speak.”

deacons (for he seems to speak of both), and we may, in the passages already quoted, substitute the more general for the more special meaning by which we at first render it. We shall then find Clement saying, "Blessed are those religious officers," etc.; "It is a shame that the ancient Church of Corinth should revolt against its religious officers"; "Be at peace with your appointed religious officers." Religious officers had been called "presbyters" by those to whom he writes. The word was associated with the thought of important religious functions. It was surrounded with ideas of respect and honour, and this to an extent which could not yet have fallen to the lot of the words "bishops" and "deacons." By his use of it Clement would awaken these associations, and would call up these feelings. He would, as it were, say, For you, O Corinthians, the Apostles appointed bishops and deacons. These are your presbyters, your reverends; whatever you have been wont to think of as due to the latter is due to them. On this view the word "presbyter" does not express an office in the Christian Church at all. At the moment we have in view it is, in that Church, if one may so speak, a clerical title by which the clergy are distinguished from the laity,<sup>1</sup> and by the use of which the laity are reminded of what they owe to those who have been set over them in the Lord.<sup>2</sup>

In a matter such as that before us, the test of any theory is that it takes up and meets the different phenomena to be accounted for. We have seen that this is effected in the case of Clement's epistle by the theory now suggested. But that is not enough. The question must still be asked, Does it meet the phenomena in connexion with the same subject presented by the New Testament

<sup>1</sup> Comp. chap. xl. of the epistle.

<sup>2</sup> Harnack says: "Clement has as yet no idea of an ecclesiastical order of regularly appointed presbyters" (*Expositor* for May, 1887, p. 334, note 5). In his *Apost. Zeitalter*, Weizsäcker has come to the same conclusion, p. 637.

and the other Christian literature of the early Church? We take Scripture first.

In Philippians i. 1, St. Paul salutes all the saints that are at Philippi, "including bishops and deacons." The Apostle does not say, as he is always made to say, "with the bishops and deacons," a form of expression which might have left it possible to allege that he passes over presbyters, because they had taken no part in collecting the contributions which he was about to acknowledge. In such a case we should have had the article before *ἐπισκόποις*. But the absence of the article shows us that the summary of the persons constituting the Christian Church at Philippi is *complete*. Either therefore "bishops" and "presbyters" denoted at Philippi the same *office*, and were interchangeable official terms, or there were no official "presbyters" in the Christian Church of that city. There is an absence of proof, there is even every probability against the supposition, that the first of these explanations is correct, and we must therefore have recourse to the second. Had there been officers known as "presbyters" in the Philippian Church, St. Paul could not have failed to mention them on this occasion.

In his first Epistle to Timothy St. Paul gives directions with regard to the character and qualifications of such as might fitly be appointed officers in the Church. Doing so, how shall we explain the fact that he passes presbyters entirely over, except by the supposition that there were no Christian officers known by that name? At chap. iii. 2, he treats of "bishops," at v. 8 of the same chap. of "deacons." Not a word is said of presbyters; and yet it would appear from chap. iii. 14, 15, that the Apostle intended his instructions to be exhaustive. No doubt we read the word *πρεσβυτέρω* at chap. v. 1, but in such a connexion that we can hardly understand by it anything except an older man. At chap. v. 17, we read also, "Let

the presbyters that preside well over the Church be counted worthy of double honour," but the general meaning of the word "presbyter," the effect of which we are at present trying, not only suits the passage, but gives far more force to it. Why limit the *προεστῶτες* to one of the classes spoken of in the previous chapters of the epistle? Still more, why apply the word to a class of office-bearers not previously named, unless we are compelled to do so? It is much more likely that the Apostle would desire to see double honour paid to deserving deacons as well as bishops, as also more natural to think that he would still have in his mind the office-bearers whose qualifications he had just been engaged in describing. This sense we obtain if we suppose *πρεσβύτεροι* to be used in that wider meaning which had come to be associated with it. Similar remarks apply to the use of *πρεσβυτέρου* in chap. v. 19. One passage in this epistle is indeed more difficult than these, chap. iv. 14, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands *τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*." But this word does *not* mean a college of presbyters. It was a name applied to the Sanhedrin in its larger form in Jerusalem, and probably also in smaller forms in the country towns.<sup>1</sup> When therefore it was transferred to a Christian court, that court must have borne some distinct resemblance to the Jewish. But the latter included much more than presbyters (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5, and comp. 1 Macc. xii. 6; Matt. xxvi. 59). The former must have done so too. It would consist of the Apostles when present, and of the bishops and deacons; and it would receive its name because Christians would say to themselves, That is *our* "presbytery." The Jewish congregations have theirs, consisting of their office-bearers. In like manner we have ours.

In the Epistle to Titus the two words "bishop" and

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, iii.

“presbyter” again meet us, and that in a very instructive connexion. At chap. i. 5, we read, “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest appoint presbyters in every city”; and then, having alluded to some of the necessary qualifications, the Apostle goes on, “for the bishop must be blameless,” etc. That the words “presbyter” and “bishop” here refer to the same persons, no one will for an instant deny. Are both these official names for the same office? If so, there is immediate danger of confusion. There is no such danger on the supposition we are trying, that the first term suggests the general idea of a person appointed to a religious office, the second the idea of the particular office to which he is appointed.

In the Acts of the Apostles the word “presbyter” frequently occurs. One of the most instructive of these occasions is that, so often referred to, in chap. xx. 17 comp. 28, a passage of which it is unnecessary to say more than that it strikingly confirms all that has been said. The two words “presbyter” and “bishop” are there used precisely as we should expect to find, if the former denotes religious office generally, the latter a particular office in the Church, with those special duties assigned to it which are immediately afterwards described. In Acts xi. 30, xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, xvi. 4, and xxi. 18, we have the Christian Church in Jerusalem before us; and, although it is obvious that in every one of these cases the general meaning of “presbyter” affords an excellent sense, it is also possible that in the sacred metropolis of Judaism Jewish arrangements might be retained longer than elsewhere. These passages therefore do not supply the basis of an argument to the same extent as the others that we have considered. Acts xiv. 23 again is an important text. We are told there of St. Paul and Barnabas, who were passing at the time through a part of Asia Minor, that, when they had appointed for them presbyters in every Church and had prayed with



fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they had believed." But one explanation of the statement may be, that we have here no appointment of office-bearers according to the *full Christian plan*. It is at least worthy of notice that, while praying and fasting are expressly mentioned, thus favouring the idea that St. Luke desires to describe the solemnities that took place upon the occasions spoken of, he says nothing of that laying on of hands which the analogy of other passages would lead us to expect (Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3, xix. 5, 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Tim. v. 22); while at the same time it is hardly possible to think of the latter as included under the word "commended" (*παρέθετο*), a comparison with chap. xx. 32 forbidding such a supposition. The word used for appointing (*χειροτονεῖν*) leads us also to the thought of a purely popular election in which the Apostles took no part.<sup>1</sup> The communities alluded to being, then, mainly Judæo-Christian, and, as so recently converted, not yet ready for new arrangements, it is perfectly natural to think that they received at the moment only a temporary provision for their need, until they should be ready for "bishops and deacons." Even this supposition, however, is unnecessary. St. Luke might speak as he does, although he had the latter classes of office-bearers in his eye. To him and to his readers the word "presbyters" suggested the idea of congregational office-bearers, and he might with perfect appropriateness employ it, if he was thinking of office-bearers in general rather than of any special class of such, or of any special duties to be discharged by them.

James v. 14 is also Judæo-Christian, and so are all the passages in the Revelation of St. John where the "presbyters" appear.

St. Peter's use of the word may be noticed for a moment. In 1 Peter v. 1, the Apostle exhorts "presbyters," and

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the use of the word in the *Didaché*, chap. xv. 1.

speaks of himself as their "fellow-presbyter." Yet we have here the idea of a general religious functionary rather than that of a special officer designated by the name "presbyter." In the latter sense St. Peter was not a presbyter; he was an Apostle. He shared no *office* with any Christian official beneath the apostolate. But he was a fellow-worker in God's house, a fellow-ploughman in God's furrow, with all who were labouring in the same spirit, and for the same ends, as himself (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10); and his presbyterate is thus to be understood in its widest and not in its most limited sense. On the other hand, when in the same epistle he rises to the thought of the great Head of the Church as One who, through His work on His people's behalf, had grounded an official relation between Himself and them, he does not speak of the presbyter, but of the "bishop," of their souls (chap. ii. 25).

On the use of the word "presbyter" in the second and third Epistles of St. John it is not necessary to dwell.

It would thus appear that, in every passage of the New Testament in which we read of "presbyters," that word may be taken in the sense borne by it in the Epistle of Clement, without injury to the meaning, and in some instances with positive advantage to it.

Want of space will hardly permit more than a brief allusion to other literature of the early Christian age. It may be enough to say that, if in the New Testament and in Clement we find the combination "bishops and deacons," we find the same combination in the *Didaché* (chap. xv. 1). So far as I am aware, we never meet at this early date with the combination "presbyters and deacons," but always with "bishops and deacons."<sup>1</sup> Such a fact requires

<sup>1</sup> At a later date we meet with it, as in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, where the younger men are exhorted to submit themselves "to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ" (§ 5). Yet even here the word "presbyters" may include "bishops." We know from Phil. i. 1 that there were "bishops" at Philippi, and it is difficult to account for there being no special

explanation; and, on the view taken in this paper, the explanation is simple.

One point more demands explanation. How came "presbyters," who, as here contended, were not apostolically appointed officers in the Christian Church, so soon to gain not only an official, but even so important an official, position as they seem at least to hold in the Ignatian epistles? The answer to this question may be found in the following considerations. Although not apostolically appointed, there always were "presbyters" in the Christian congregations. They had had official position in the Jewish Church; and that alone would lead not only Judæo- but even Gentile- Christian congregations to recognise them as an important class. Even without this precedent, they would soon, as the older men of the congregation, gain a position which, if not official, would touch the borders of official dignity. This would more readily take place if, as there is reason to believe, the teaching of the congregation, which was at first free to all, began to fall mainly into their hands,<sup>1</sup> and that with general consent. Nothing could contribute more than the discharge of this latter function to increase their importance; and it need not surprise us that by the time Ignatius wrote they became what they were. The result is not to be attributed to pride or ambition or love of power. It would come about by natural and easy steps then, just as it would come about, were the general condition of things the same, by the same steps now.

Thus too we see how the name "presbyter," after having lived for a time with its more vague and general, would

mention of them in Polycarp's epistle, unless on the supposition that, as the religious office-bearers of the Church, they might be called "presbyters."

<sup>1</sup> This idea finds strong confirmation in the words of Hermas in *Vis.* iii. 5, who mentions as the great stones in the building of the Church, *Apostoli et episcopi et doctores et ministri*. These *doctores* would seem to be the presbyters. Comp. Hefele, *Patres Apos.*, in loc.

resume its older and more special, meaning. Only during a period immediately following the apostolical appointment of bishops and deacons would it, as the familiar "clerical" designation, be applied to them. But, as the presbyters, who had not died out, who were still the more venerable men of the congregation, and who as teachers enjoyed so much of the confidence of the people, rose in importance, they would naturally again impart to the word a fulness of meaning equal to what it had once enjoyed, and peculiar to themselves.

If then we now endeavour to sum up the particulars of Clement's historical view of the origin of the Christian ministry (which is at the same time confirmed from other sources), it may be stated as follows. In the very earliest stage of the Christian Church there existed only the lay members of the congregation and, according to their number, more or fewer Church officers called "presbyters," who were probably nominated by the people to exercise a certain control in congregational affairs. Strifes, as was quite natural, arose between the congregation and its presbyters. The latter had been appointed by the former. Why should the former not express dissatisfaction with them, or even displace them if it pleased? The Apostles foresaw this, and, guided by the Spirit, resolved to take means for providing a fixed and definite order of men to superintend the congregations; and that, not only for their own, but for all future, time. In doing so, they had not to think so much of teaching, which was to a large extent at least free, to some extent in the hands of the already existing presbyters; they had to think mainly of the general management of the services and congregational affairs. Already in their own case they had experienced the benefit of the appointment of the seven "deacons." They appointed therefore, not only "bishops" to do in their stead in the congregations what they could

not, but they added assistants to the "bishops." In other words, they appointed "bishops and deacons." In making these arrangements, they left the "presbyters" undisturbed. Then they did not appoint; but they did not interfere with them; they recognised them; they left them to go on with the consent of the congregations in their own way. Still further, however, the Apostles had to think of future generations as well as of the men of their own age. They did so. They made provision that the "bishops," or perhaps these with the aid of their "deacons," should continue a succession of office-bearers like themselves, when suitable persons could be fixed upon with the consent and approval of the Church. By what means such successors were to be solemnly set apart to their office, Clement does not say. But all the other evidence upon the point leads us to the thought of that prayer and laying on of hands with which we are familiar in the New Testament, and which was God's appointed instrumentality for the conveyance of His blessing. As to the names to be used, the proper designation of those thus appointed by the Apostles, and keeping up the succession, is "bishops," assisted if needs be by their "deacons." "Presbyter" is not the name of a Christian *office* instituted by the Apostles. It is an old and venerable title applied to religious officers; and, as such, the new officers may appropriately enough come under the old name. A bishop and a deacon may both be spoken of as presbyters. As time runs on, even so soon as the days of Hermas, there will be a difference; but that lay beyond the horizon of Clement's view.

Of the important consequences deducible from this view of the origin of the Christian ministry there is no time to speak.

W. MILLIGAN.

---



THE "DIDACHÉ" AND JUSTIN MARTYR.

TRACES OF THE SO CALLED "TEACHING OF THE  
TWELVE APOSTLES" IN THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN.

HAVING shown reason elsewhere to think that Justin Martyr may have known the substance of our written *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, as part of "the words of *The Teaching*" (τῆς διδαχῆς) which he had received, and having stated generally that its less transparent passages are explained and illustrated by his works, I propose now to go in order through the manual, to note its successive points of contact with his *Apologies* and his *Dialogue with Trypho*, and thus to show more in detail the grounds of the propositions, that he was familiar with its substance and its teaching, and that his writings are in effect the best commentary upon it, in so far as it is to be explained from the Old Testament by the rule of interpretation which it lays down in the words, "For even so likewise did the ancient prophets" (chap. xi.). It is on its second part only (chaps. vii.-xvi.) that he is a virtual commentator. The first part, on the "Two Ways" (chaps. i.-vi.), is too simple on the whole to need an interpreter and too elementary for Justin to quote in detail; but this part too may be traced, in substance and in principle, in his writings, and he reproduces whatever is distinctive in it and characteristic of it.

I. TRACES OF THE "TWO WAYS" IN THE WRITINGS  
OF JUSTIN.

1. The *Teaching* commences with the statement, "*There are two ways, the way of life and the way of death; and there is much difference between the two ways.*"

Justin does not so designate the two ways, although he must have been familiar with that mode of speaking, if only from Jeremiah xxi. 8, "Behold, I set before you *the*

*way of life, and the way of death.*" But he instinctively expresses himself in terms of the doctrine of the two ways when he writes that every one *is going* to eternal punishment or salvation (*Apol.* i. 12), using the word *πορεύεσθαι*, *to journey*, in contrast with St. Matthew's *ἀπελεύσονται*, of which the sense is quite different. Barnabas (*Epist.* xix., xx.) supplies the link between the *Didaché* and Justin when he writes, "Thou shalt not join thyself with them that *walk* (*πορευομένων*) in the way of death. . . . For it is a way of death *eternal with retribution.*" Justin describes converts to Christianity as leaving the *way of error* (*Dial.* 258 A), with which may be compared in the *Didaché*, "Take heed lest any make thee to *err from this way* of the Teaching" (chap. vi.). "By this way," writes Justin at the end of his *Dialogue*, it is given to man to be blessed; and there is no other way than this (263 B) whereby to obtain remission of sins and inherit the promises.

2. "*The way of life is this: First, thou shalt love God that made thee; secondly, thy neighbour as thyself; and all things whatsoever thou wouldest should not happen (μὴ γίνεσθαι) to thee, neither do thou to another*" (chap. i.).

Looking at the form of these sayings, and their arrangement in the *Teaching*, we note four particulars in which they differ from the Gospel, in all of which Justin follows or agrees with the *Teaching*.

(1) In his first *Apology* he quotes a number of sayings from the Gospel, and among them, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve, with all thy heart and with all thy strength, the Lord *God that made thee*" (63 D). Here he confounds the saying, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve," with the saying, which he rightly quotes separately from the former in his *Dialogue* (321 A), "Thou shalt *love*

the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy strength." Then, knowing (as we may conjecture) another form of the great commandment, namely, "First, thou shalt love *God that made thee*," he concludes with the words taken from it, τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε. In this he differs from the Gospel and agrees with the *Teaching*. In three more particulars he differs from the former and agrees with the latter, in the following passage from chapter 93 of the *Dialogue with Trypho* :

"For one may see such persons also *not desiring to be treated as they themselves treat others* (μὴ τὰ αὐτὰ παθεῖν βουλομένους ἄπερ αὐτοὶ τοὺς ἄλλους διατιθέασι), and with unfriendly consciences blaming in one another things that they perpetrate. Whence it seems to me to have been well said by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that all righteousness and piety are summed up in the two commandments, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy strength; and thy neighbour as thyself*. For he who loves God with his whole heart and strength, being of a wholly Godfearing disposition, will honour no other god; and he will honour that Angel, as God desireth, who is loved by the Lord God Himself. And he who loves his neighbour as himself *will desire for him too the good things which he desires for himself* (ἄπερ ἑαυτῷ βούλεται ἀγαθὰ καὶ κείνῳ βουλήσεται); and no one will desire evil things for himself. He then that loves his neighbour will both pray and endeavour that the same things may *happen* (γενέσθαι) to his neighbour as to himself. Now a man's neighbour is none other than that reasoning being of like passions, man. All righteousness then being divided into two parts, duty to God and men, whoever (saith the word) loves the Lord God with his whole heart and his whole strength, and his neighbour as himself, must be truly righteous."

(2) In this passage there are traces of the *negative* form

of the Golden Rule, which is not found in the Gospel, in the words, *not desiring to be treated as they treat others*, and the words, *no one will desire evil things for himself*, which imply that he should *not desire them for his neighbour*. If indeed the rule had never been formulated negatively, its positive form would of course have included the prohibition, not to do to others things that a man wishes not to have done to himself. Thus in the *Clementine Homilies* (vii. 4), we read in the positive form, in words resembling Justin's, that one should design for his neighbour the good things he desires for himself (*ἄπερ ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ βούλεται καλὰ, τὰ αὐτὰ βουλευέσθω καὶ τῷ πλήσιον*), while the illustrations which follow are prohibitions, "Slay not, because thou wouldest not be slain," etc. And in another place (xii. 32; cf. xi. 4) of the same, after negative as well as positive illustrations, the conclusion "in one word" is positively, *ὃ θέλει ἑαυτῷ θέλει καὶ τῷ πλήσιον*, *what he wishes for himself, he wishes for his neighbour*. But since negative forms of the rule were to be found in Tobit, Philo, and the Talmud, not to say also in the *Teaching*, there is no need to doubt that Justin had in mind some negative form of it.

(3) The phraseology of the rule as it stands in the *Teaching* seems to be peculiar to the manual itself and the documents derived from it, unless the "Western" reading in Acts xv. 29, *καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλητε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἐτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖτε*, is due to a quite independent tradition. Now Justin, in the above passage, writes *γενέσθαι*, in contrast with the *ποιῶσιν . . . ποιεῖτε* of the Gospels; and, considering his other points of contact with this part of the *Teaching*, it seems quite likely that his word *γενέσθαι* is a reminiscence of the *γίνεσθαι* of the *Teaching*, and that the negative form of the rule which he had in mind was the form preserved to us therein; for the word in question, so far as we know, was not used in any other form of the rule, positive or negative, then current.

(4) Moreover, like the *Teaching*, Justin brings the two Great Commandments and the Golden Rule together; whereas in the Gospels the former are found in Matthew xxii. 37, Mark xii. 30, and Luke x. 27, and the latter in the different contexts, Matthew vii. 12 and Luke vi. 31, and not at all in the Gospel according to St. Mark. It was doubtless intended by the writer of the *Teaching* that the rule should be deduced from the command, *Thy neighbour as thyself*, as is done by Justin and in effect by St. Paul, who teaches that to *work no ill* to one's neighbour is the outcome of the principle, *Love thy neighbour as thyself* (Rom. xiii. 10). This second commandment may be regarded as itself contained in the first. But suffice it here to say that Justin, like the writer of the *Didaché*, joined together the "Two Commandments" and the Golden Rule, and regarded all duty to God and man as summed up in them. Consequently, even if there were no further traces of the *Didaché* in the writings of Justin, the proof that he knew these three sayings only as they stand in it would justify the inference that he knew the "Two Ways" generally, and more or less as they are expounded in chapters i.-vi. And we have shown that he probably knew the first from his use of the words τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε, and the third for the two reasons just given, and the three together according to their grouping in the *Didaché* and not in the Gospel.

3. "The teaching of these words is this: Bless them that curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for them that persecute you. For what thank is it if ye love them that love you? do not even the Gentiles the same? but do ye love them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy" (chap. i.).

The two sayings, *Pray for your enemies* and *Love them that hate you*, are found in Justin's writings, but not in the



Gospels, which read, "*Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you*" (Matt. v. 44); or "*Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you*" (Luke vi. 27, 28). Justin indeed knows the command of Jesus "to love even enemies," and finds it in Isaiah lxvi., "Say, *Our brethren, to them that hate you,*" etc.; but his favourite phrase is, "*Pray for your enemies.*" Thus, for example, he writes in *Apol.* i. 15, "*But I say unto you, Pray for your enemies, and love them that hate you, and bless them that curse you*"; all of which sayings are in the *Teaching*, but the third only in the Gospels; and he repeats them in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, at the end of chapter 133. It has been noticed by Harnack that Justin (*Apol.* i. 15) and the *Didaché* agree in the construction, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, whereas in the New Testament καταρᾶσθαι is followed by the accusative.

In *Apost. Const.* vii. 2, the section under consideration reads thus: "Bless them that curse you, pray for *them that despitefully use you, love your enemies*: . . . but do ye love (φιλεῖτε, instead of ἀγαπᾶτε) them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy"; where the later compiler has taken, "*Love your enemies,*" from the Gospel, and has put τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς after *Pray for*, and a different word for *love* in the sayings which follow. Thus all its variations are explained as arising from the substitution of "*Love your enemies,*" taken from the Gospel, for a cognate precept of the *Didaché*.

With the saying, "*Love them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy,*" Harnack aptly compares, from Justin's *Apol.* i. 14, ". . . praying for our enemies, and trying to win over (πέθειν πειρώμενοι) those who hate us wrongfully." Addressing himself to them that curse the faithful, Justin says (*Dial.* 335 D), "We do not hate you, but pray that you may all *repent* and obtain mercy."

And again, in *Dial.* 254 B, "Wherefore even for you, and all other men who are at enmity (ἐχθραϊόντων) with us, we pray that *repenting with us* ye may not blaspheme Him who," etc. That he may be actually paraphrasing the saying, καὶ οὐχ ἕξετε ἐχθρόν, seems likely enough when his πείθειν πειρώμενοι is read in the light of the *Clementines* above referred to, in which it is said, in Hom. xii. 32, "The just man tries (πειράται) to love even enemies and to bless revilers. Yea, moreover, even to *pray for enemies*, to pity injurers. . . . He uses persuasion with one who is enraged, *he reconciles his enemy* (ὀργιζόμενον πείθει, τὸν ἐχθρὸν διαλλάσσει). . . . Knowing that he himself when he sins does not wish to be punished, so he who loves his neighbour as himself does not punish others who sin against him. . . . In a word, what he wishes for himself, he wishes for his neighbour. This is the law of God. This is τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ διδασκαλία." "These evil and good actions," the homilist set forth as "two ways," showing by what ways respectively they that walk therein go to destruction, or are saved by God's guidance (Hom. vii. 4-7). If by his τὸν ἐχθρὸν διαλλάσσει, κ.τ.λ., he is paraphrasing the saying of the *Teaching*, "Ye shall not have an enemy," we may say that Justin does likewise.

The saying, "*Fast for them that persecute you*," is peculiar to the *Teaching*, for the reason perhaps that it was a primitive and Judaic form of saying, to which another form was afterwards deliberately preferred. It is best illustrated by Esther iv. 16, "*And fast ye for me*. . . . I also and my maidens will fast likewise." As it stands, it marks a climax. Return good words and wishes for evil, as occasion may arise; pray for your proclaimed enemies; fast for them when they are doing their worst against you. Fasting of course implies prayer of special earnestness. Thus, while the *Didaché* in chapter vii. orders the baptizer and others who are able to *fast* with and in

a measure for the person to be baptized, Justin writes: ". . . We *praying and fasting with them*" (συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς, *Apol.* i. 61). It may be conjectured accordingly that the saying, *Fast for . . .* became successively, *Fast and pray for . . .*, and then, "*Pray for them that persecute you.*"

Corresponding to the next section of chapter i. of the *Didaché*, and at the same time to the Gospel Justin writes in *Apol.* i. 16, "To him that smiteth thy cheek offer also the other. And him that taketh away thy tunic or cloak, hinder not. . . . And every one that impresseth thee a mile, follow thou twain." The chapter ends with two seemingly, but I think it may be shown not actually, contradictory sayings on almsgiving: the one inculcating absolutely free giving,—"*Give to every one that asketh thee,*" etc.; the other limiting the giver's obligation by the proviso,—"*till thou know to whom thou shouldest give.*" Justin writes, "εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς δεομένοις . . . ταῦτα ἔφη, Give ye to every one that asketh" (*Apol.* i. 15), saying in effect, "Give, not to *every one* that asketh (Luke vi. 30), but to every one *in need* that asketh." Thus he qualifies the words of the Gospel, and he may or may not have had the *Teaching* also in mind (p. 371).

#### 4. Chapters ii. and v.

The elementary precepts of chapter ii., such as, *Thou shalt not murder*, and the list of offences in chapter v., are briefly disposed of by Justin in chapter 93 of his *Dialogue*, where he says, "Every race knows that *adultery*, and *fornication*, and *manslaying*, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα, are evil." But the chapter contains also some less commonplace sayings, and traces of all of these are found in the writings of Justin.

οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις.—This rare word is characteristic of the "Two Ways" and the writings which quote or are

based upon it. It is found in the exposition of the way "of light" by Barnabas. Again, Clement of Alexandria, in a passage cited by Bryennius, quotes in the name of Moses, but really from the *Didaché*, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις. Justin, in his *Dialogue*, chapter 95, writes: "For every race of men will be found under a curse, according to the law of Moses. For cursed (it is said) is every one who continues not in all the things written in the book of the law to do them. And no one ever did them all exactly—nor will even you dare to gain-say—but some observed them to a greater and some to a less degree than their fellows. But if those under this law are under a curse from not observing all things in it, are not the *Gentiles* (ἔθνη) much more under a curse, worshipping idols as they do, καὶ παιδοφθοροῦντα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα κακὰ ἐργαζόμενα?" This favours the view that the early part of the *Teaching*, to which Justin, no less than Clement, may be alluding, was designed especially for Gentile catechumens.

οὐ μαγεύσεις.—They who before conversion used *magic arts*, writes Justin, have now consecrated themselves to God (*Apol.* i. 14).

οὐ φαρμακεύσεις.—Many persons possessed, he writes, had been healed in Rome and elsewhere by exorcism in the name of Jesus Christ, who could not get healing from any of the other exorcists, καὶ ἐπαστῶν καὶ φαρμακευτῶν (*Apol.* ii. 6). This illustrates also the μηδὲ ἐπαιδός of chapter iii.

οὐδὲ γεννηθέντα ἀποκτενεῖς.—We have been *taught*, writes Justin, that to expose καὶ τὰ γεννώμενα is the act of wicked men: . . . If an infant, through being exposed, were to die, we should be guilty of murder (*Apol.* i. 27–29). Where in a course of systematic *Teaching* could this come but in such a context as chapter ii. of the *Didaché*?

"Thou shalt not hate any man; but some thou shalt

rebuke, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love more than thy life."

Using a peculiar word for *to love* in the first instance, Justin writes, "But concerning *loving* (στέργειν) *all*, He taught the following: . . . But I say unto you, *Pray* for your enemies, and *love* (ἀγαπάτε) them that hate you" (*Apol.* i. 15). The general sense of the saying, "Thou shalt not hate," etc., is so well given by his στέργειν ἅπαντας, that he is not improbably alluding to it in this place.

The pseudo-Barnabas, in his rhetorical way, takes the last part of the saying, namely, "Some thou shalt love *more than thy life*," and makes it generally applicable. In Tatian's *Diatessaron* (Zahn, *Forsch. zur Gesch. der N.T. Kanon's*, i. 143: 1881) we read, "Qui Me non amat *plus quam animam suam*," such an one "cannot be My disciple." Clement of Alexandria, in *Quis Div. Salv.* 28, "Thy neighbour as thyself," writes, "Therefore God ὑπὲρ σεαυτόν."

### 5. Chapter iii.

Chapter iii. consists of warnings against all evil and all that is *like to it*. It prohibits evil tendencies as leading to actual breaches of the commandments, as when it says, "My child, be not a luster, for lust leads to fornication." Justin covers the same ground by referring to the Gospel as condemning not the outward act only, but the evil desire, and adding generally, that not *acts* only, but inmost *thoughts* are manifest before God (*Apol.* i. 15). On the word ἐπαιδός in this chapter see above, in section 4 (p. 367). Our Lord, writes Justin, desires that we should not be imitators of bad men, but in patience and meekness should lead all away from αἰσχύνης καὶ ἐπιθυμίας τῶν κακῶν (*Apol.* i. 16).

### 6. Chapter iv.

"Thou shalt seek out day by the faces of the saints, that thou mayest rest thee on their words."



To this corresponds in Justin *καὶ σὺνεσμεν ἀλλήλοις ἀεί*, "And we after these things are continually putting one another in remembrance of them; and we that possess help all that lack; and we are together always" (*Apol.* i. 67). The brethren were much in one another's company for mutual comfort and confirmation in the faith. In the *Clementine Homilies* (iv. 69) we read, "And before all things come together more continually; εἴθε καθ' ὥραν, would that it might be hourly!" Justin in *Apol.* i. 14, contrasting the manner of life of Christians with their former life, writes that they who before conversion had been, before all things, fond of amassing money and property, now brought what they had into a common fund, and imparted to every one who had need. This of course illustrates what is said in chapter iv. of the *Didaché*: "Thou shalt give a share in all things to thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thine own." But Justin goes on to say that before they became Christians men of alien race hated and slew one another, and would not dwell together. They would not live at the same fireside (ἐστία). In contrast with this the "saints" did not merely live together, in the sense of having a common "table," but they associated very much with one another for mutual edification, and *were-together* continually. Justin's ἀεὶ ἀναμνησκόμεν is the natural outcome of the *Didaché* precept, "Him that speaketh to thee the word of the Lord thou shalt remember night and day"; for not the speaker merely, but the things spoken were to be held in continual remembrance.

#### 7. Chapter vi.

"Take heed lest any make thee to err from this Way of The Teaching, seeing he teacheth thee not according to God. For if indeed thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect. But if thou art not able, do what thou canst. And concerning food, bear what thou art able. But

beware exceedingly of that which is sacrificed to idols; for it is a service of dead gods."

Justin explains, in chapter 20 of his *Dialogue*, why the Jews were commanded by Moses to abstain from some kinds of food. At the end of chapter 34 of the same he endorses the above strong prohibition of meats sacrificed to idols, the eating of which he couples with idolatry. "Solomon (he says) was led by a woman to worship idols, which they from among the Gentiles that have been brought to the knowledge of God the Creator of all things through Jesus that was crucified will not endure to do, but endure rather every torture and penalty to the worst of deaths, than worship idols or *eat things sacrificed to idols*." Trypho (chap. 35) objects that some professing Christians did (he had heard) eat things sacrificed to idols, and said that no harm came of it. To this Justin replies that, while there were such men, who called themselves Christians, and confessed the crucified Jesus as Lord and Christ, and yet did not teach His doctrines (διδάγματα), but those of the spirits of error, "we, the disciples of the true and pure Teaching (διδασκαλίας) of Jesus Christ, are more faithful and firm in the hope that has been announced by Him." Thus he holds that to abstain from τὸ εἰδωλοθύτον is of the essence of the *Teaching*; for he knows that the "gods" set up in the temples, and honoured with sacrifices and garlands, "are soulless and *dead* things, and have not the form of God" (*Apol.* i. 9).

8. That Justin should have been familiar with the substance of chapters i.-vi. of the *Teaching*, as the above coincidences go far to prove that he was, may be said to have been *à priori* probable: for (1) the *Epistle of Barnabas* contains an exposition of the "Two Ways," based upon an older exposition, like that in the *Didaché* of Bryennius, if not identical therewith; and (2) Justin has so much in common with that *Epistle*, which points

unmistakably to interdependence, or dependence on a common tradition, that some eminent scholars suppose him to have read it, and some doubt whether he had done so or not. If he had read it, he would have read in it the "Two Ways" according to Barnabas; and it would then have been easy to show that he too, like Barnabas, knew an older form of it, much like that in our *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. But if, as seems more likely, the two writers simply drew from a common source, this would in all probability have included the simple ethical teaching of the "Two Ways," which had been formulated before the time of Justin, and was known to Barnabas. The presumption would still have been that it was known to him, even if he had not cared to make specific allusion to any of its prohibitions of things which "*every race knows to be evil*" (p. 366).

9. Granted that the *Teaching* is perhaps a composite document embodying an old tract on the "Two Ways" as one of its elements, Justin may have known thus much of it, and no more. But if he knew the sayings, "*Bless them that curse you, and pray for your enemies,*" etc., as part of the tract, which (there is good reason to think) did not originally contain them, then, unless they can be proved to have been interpolated in the "Two Ways" before it was connected with chapters vii.-xvi., one might fairly infer provisionally that he knew the *Teaching* in its entirety. It has not indeed been proved that he knew the sayings on almsgiving in its first chapter; but there was no occasion to say more on that subject than he has done. The writing which has most in common with these sayings is the *Shepherd of Hermas*; and those who hold that Hermas quotes them will allow it to be a tenable view that they were known to Justin Martyr.

C. TAYLOR.

(To be continued.)

CHRIST' CRUCIFIED AND RISEN.

IN a former paper I endeavoured to expound the meaning St. Paul intended to convey by a remarkable group of phrases in which he represents the death and resurrection of Christ as reproduced in His servants. My aim now is to reach in some measure the conceptions of the death and resurrection of Christ and of their relation to the salvation of men which underlay, and prompted, these phrases; or, in other words, to elucidate their bearing on the doctrine of the Atonement.

We shall thus pursue the best method and order of theological research. For our only reliable sources of knowledge of the gospel preached by Christ are the extant writings of His early followers. And these we shall best use as windows through which to look into each writer's mind in order to read there his conception of Christ and the gospel. A further stage of inquiry is to compare these various conceptions, in order thus to form a conception of our own, as full and correct as possible, of the Nature and Work of the Son of God.

It is impossible to doubt that the phrases *crucified* and *dead with Christ* refer to the actual and historic death of Christ upon the cross. This reference is very clear in Romans vi. 9, *Knowing that Christ, raised from the dead, dies no more: of Him death is no longer lord*; a passage referring indisputably to historical facts. For these facts are quoted to explain verse 8, *If we died with Christ*: and the significance of the facts is explained by the words following, *In that He died, He died to sin once*. Similarly, in Galatians vi. 14 *the cross* in which St. Paul gloried can be no other than the timber on which He died. Yet we are told that by means of that cross the world had been crucified to St. Paul and he to the world. This reference

to historic fact is confirmed by many other passages in the group before us.

Looking now at the group of passages from this point of view, we see at once that the historic fact of Christ's death occupied in the mind of St. Paul a position absolutely unique, one never occupied, so far as the literature of the world testifies, by the death of any other person who ever lived and died on earth. Evidently St. Paul believed that his salvation and that of all Christians comes through the death of Christ upon the cross, that they live and will for ever live because He died, that had He not died no life eternal would now await them. It is equally certain that the Apostle believed that this good result was not accidental, but was designed by Christ Himself, and by the Father, who sent His Son into the world. This last point finds conspicuous expression in 2 Corinthians v. 15, *He died . . . that they may live for Him who on their behalf died and rose*. And it underlies his entire teaching about the death of Christ.

The same belief underlies also other phraseology frequent throughout the letters of St. Paul. If Christ died of His own free choice in order to save men from sin and death, a salvation otherwise impossible, then were His death and blood the ransom-price of our life; and the words *redemption* and *bought-off*<sup>1</sup> are explained and justified. For, any costly means used to attain an end not otherwise possible, we speak of as a price paid for it. In the same way, the word *propitiation* used to describe the purpose and result of the death of Christ finds adequate explanation. For if Christ saves us from death, the penalty of sin, by Himself dying, then His death shelters the head of the sinner from the punishment due to His sin; the exact meaning in the Old Testament of the common Hebrew word whose Greek equivalent is in the New Testament rendered *propitiation*.

<sup>1</sup> As in Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 23.



Moreover, in addition to the group of phrases discussed in my last paper, and the two words just mentioned, the Epistles of St. Paul are full of categorical statements that our salvation comes through the death and blood of Christ, and that for this end He died. A galaxy of such plain assertions shines upon us in Romans v. 6-10: *Christ . . . died on behalf of ungodly men, died on our behalf, justified in His blood, reconciled to God through the death of His Son.* All this places beyond a shadow of doubt, as matter of fact, that St. Paul believed and taught that the historic death of Christ upon the cross is the means of our salvation, and that for this end He died. This assured fact, mental and yet in some sense historic, demands explanation.

The urgency of this demand is increased by other facts. The belief underlying the phraseology peculiar to St. Paul underlies also other forms of speech found in the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John, documents very different in thought and expression from the writings of the Apostle to the Gentiles. For instance, in 1 John i. 7 we read, *The blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin.* This can only mean that through the death of Christ comes deliverance from the defilement of sin. Christ is represented in John x. 11, 15, as twice saying that *the Good Shepherd lays down His life for the sheep*; and His words are re-echoed in 1 John iii. 16: *He laid down His life on our behalf.* Very remarkable are the words of Christ recorded in John xii. 24: *Except the grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it remains alone; but if it die, it bears much fruit.* Language equally clear and strong proves that the writers of the Synoptist Gospels gave to the death of Christ the same significance. So, in Matthew xx. 28, we read, *The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many*; and in chap. xxvi. 28, *The blood of the covenant which is being poured out for the forgiveness of sins.* All this proves most clearly that not only St. Paul but the early followers

of Christ generally, men differing most widely in their modes of apprehending the gospel, agree in a firm belief that the salvation He proclaimed comes through His death, and that this was taught by Christ Himself.

This united belief, which is attested as an historic fact, by copious and trustworthy evidence, demands explanation. We naturally ask, Whence came it? and How did it gain the firm and deep root revealed by the abundant and various outgrowth of expression?

This fertile conception cannot have been derived from the animal sacrifices which held so important a place in the Old Covenant. For the ideas of sacrifice enter only into a small part of the teaching of the New Testament about salvation through the death of Christ. And they are altogether alien from the group of passages discussed in my last paper. All this proves that the teaching before us rests upon a foundation far broader and deeper than the Jewish sacrifices.

The only possible explanation of the whole case is that the early followers of Christ were correct in their belief that the doctrine they held so firmly was taught by their Master; that He actually taught that through His death salvation would come to men, and that for this end He was about to die. Assume this, and the language attributed to Christ in the Gospels is explained by the fact that He actually spoke the words attributed to Him; as is the language about His death in the Epistles of St. Paul, St. John, and St. Peter. Deny this, and one of the most conspicuous and distinctive elements of New Testament teaching becomes an historical enigma which no one can solve.

An important question now meets us: How comes it that the death of Christ is needful for man's salvation? Upon this necessity light is cast by the teaching frequent throughout the New Testament, that Christ died for our sins: Romans iv. 25; 1 Corinthians xv. 3; Galatians i. 4;

1 Peter ii. 24, iii. 18; 1 John ii. 2; Matthew xxvi. 28. For this implies that the need for so costly a means of salvation lay in our sins.

This answer prompts at once another most important question. Why is it that man's sin made the death of Christ needful for his salvation? An answer to this further question is suggested by Romans vii. 4, perhaps the most significant phrase in the group before us: *Ye were put to death to the Law by means of the body of Christ. The body of Christ* can be no other than the sacred flesh nailed to the cross. And the connexion proves that in St. Paul's view the Law of God presented an obstacle to the sinner's reception into His favour, just as the law of matrimony forbids a woman to marry again while her husband lives; and that this obstacle was removed by the death of Christ upon the cross. A similar phrase involving similar teaching is found in Galatians ii. 19: *Through law I died to law.*

These passages are in close harmony with the very many passages connecting the death of Christ with man's sin. For *sin is lawlessness*: 1 John iii. 4.

Teaching practically the same is found in Romans iii. 25, 26: *Whom God set forth as a propitiation, through faith, in His blood, . . . that He might be Himself just and a justifier of him that is of faith in Jesus.* This implies that, apart from the death of Christ, to justify a sinner would be unjust, and therefore impossible to God; or, in other words, that the justice of God made salvation impossible except through the death of Christ. And, if so, St. Paul could correctly say that through the crucified body of Christ we were put to death to the Law. For apart from the death of Christ we should be still under its condemnation, whereas we are now as completely free from it as is a dead man from the ills of life. Moreover, since God gave Christ to die in order to pardon sinners without infringing His own Law, the death of Christ itself was a tribute to the inviolability of

the Law; and St. Paul could rightly say, *through law I died to law.*

It is impossible to explain Romans iii. 26 as meaning that God gave Christ to die in order to show to men that to pardon those who believe in Christ is not inconsistent with the justice of God. For, if justice did not in itself present a hindrance to the pardon of believers, surely it was not needful for Christ to die in order to make this known to men. In that case, certainly the Spirit of God, the Revealer of all mysteries, could have made manifest the real justice underlying apparent injustice. Moreover, that this is not the correct exposition of Romans iii. 26 is, as we have just seen, made quite clear by chap. vii. 4. For the Law is an embodiment of the justice of God. Consequently, if the death of Christ removed an obstacle to pardon presented by the Law of God, it removed an obstacle presented by His justice. Thus each of these passages supports that interpretation of the other which is most naturally suggested by the words used.

Thus far does St. Paul guide us in our endeavour to understand the relation between the death of Christ and the forgiveness of man's sin. He declares plainly again and again that salvation comes through the death of Christ, that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in man's sin, and that the impossibility of forgiving sin except through the death of Christ has its root in God Himself, in His attribute of justice.

It is now evident that the doctrine of the Atonement is not, as many say, an invention of theologians, resting only upon creeds, but is an attempt to explain an important element in the teaching of St. Paul and St. John and almost all the writers of the New Testament, an element of teaching which must have come from the lips of Christ; and an effort to reach the principles underlying it. If the doctrine as stated above be true, the language in the New

Testament about the death of Christ is explained. Unless it be true, this language is meaningless.

Accepting now as true St. Paul's teaching that the need of Christ's death for man's salvation lay in the justice of God, of which the Law is an historic embodiment, it is the difficult task of the theologian to explain this necessity. But this task lies beyond my present scope.

It is however worthy of remark that, even in human governments, to pardon the guilty by mere prerogative tends to overturn all law and overturn social order. To administer strict justice by punishment of the guilty, is for the highest welfare of the State, and is therefore on the part of a ruler the greatest kindness. Now human government is a Divine institution, and must therefore be in some points analogous to the Divine government. This being so, it is not difficult to believe that the justice of God which requires the punishment of the guilty is but one side of His love which seeks ever the highest good of His creatures. If then to pardon by mere prerogative be injurious to our race as a whole, the love of God, seeking ever the highest good of all, would present an obstacle to such forgiveness.

How the death of Christ removes this obstacle, is a question most difficult. In human government, such substitution would never be allowed. Nor would it serve the ends of justice. But we notice that the relation of Christ to the human race differs absolutely and infinitely from that of any one man to any other. The Innocent One who dies that the guilty may live, not only Himself gave life to the race, but is the Judge who condemns the guilty. And, before taking upon Himself the punishment due to us, he joined Himself to the guilty race by ties which made Him one with them, robing Himself in the bodily form which bore the curse of man's sin. Perhaps we may reverently say that He joined Himself to the guilty so closely that the punishment due to them fell upon Him who alone



could bear it without absolute and hopeless ruin, in order that just as by contact with them He shares their death so they might by contact with Him who is essential life become themselves immortal. In other words, embracing in His arms those under the burden and curse of sin, He sank with them into the grave, in order that, rising from the grave, He might raise them also. That justice took its course, even though in its course it smote the Son of God, who had united Himself to those whom justice condemned, reveals in some measure the inevitable sequence of sin and punishment. To keep this sequence before the eyes of his subjects is the aim of every just ruler.

But, whatever becomes of these poor attempts to explain it, there remains the historic fact that Christ taught that His death was needful for the pardon of the guilty. This teaching occupies so large a place in the New Testament that to deny it is to surrender one of the most distinctive features of the gospel.

That St. Paul believed without a shadow of doubt that Christ actually rose from the dead, is abundantly proved by his many plain assertions. The importance of this fact in his view is proved by his making it the ground of our faith in Christ: 1 Corinthians xv. 14-17, Romans i. 4, and a great multitude of passages. But even this abundant proof is confirmed by his remarkable teaching that believers are risen with Christ, and that the power which raised Him from the grave is already at work in them, breathing into them a new spiritual life, like that of the Risen Saviour. For a mental growth so abundant and strong and lofty proves how deeply and firmly rooted was the conception from which it sprang, namely, the historic reality of the resurrection of Christ.

To sum up the results of our study. We have seen that the group of passages which has occupied our attention, a group unique in the religious teaching of the world and

even in that of the New Testament, can be explained only as an outgrowth of a deep conviction that man's salvation comes through the death of Christ; and of a conviction that His death removed an obstacle to salvation resting upon the Law and Justice of God. Thus the passages we have studied confirm the teaching of many others in the New Testament connecting man's salvation with the death of Christ. They also prove that the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ cannot be accounted for by the animal sacrifices of the Old Covenant. For with the ideas of sacrifice this group of passages has nothing to do. A neglected element of St. Paul's teaching thus renders important confirmation to an all-important doctrine in all ages held firmly by the Universal Church of God.

In the same teaching we have also found additional proof of St. Paul's firm conviction that Christ actually rose from the dead, a conviction moulding his entire conception of the new life won by Christ for men.

This interesting subject I commend to many who look upon the doctrine of the Atonement as a matter of mere creed and dogma, or of orthodox misrepresentation; and to very many others who glory in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, because to them on that cross the world has been crucified and they crucified to the world.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

---

*THE BOOK OF PROVERBS IN THE REVISED  
VERSION.*

THE changes introduced by the Revision into the book of Proverbs are probably fewer in proportion than they are in any other book written in the higher style. The proverbs, for the most part occupying a single verse, are usually clear in meaning, and their spirit has been very happily caught in the A.V., and very pithily expressed. There are, no doubt, a considerable number of verses very obscure; but as this obscurity may be due in many cases to faults in the text, the Revision, working under such conditions as it did, could do little to remove it. A number of conjectural emendations of the text have been proposed by different individual scholars, but there is not yet any such general agreement in regard to them as would have justified their introduction into a public version of the Scriptures. In some respects the book of Proverbs is more difficult to render adequately into another language than any other biblical book. It abounds with terms which differ from one another only by a shade of meaning, and the precise shade is difficult to perceive, and even when perceptible is impossible to translate into another tongue. We have, for example, in English really only the one word "fool" by which we can safely render three or four words of the original. It is probable that not only in literature, but also in common life, these several words expressed folly on different sides; our own language however has no terms that correspond. The peculiarity of the "wisdom" is that all its terms, while sounding like intellectual terms only, are really also moral; and in the parts of the book which are of later origin certain words have already acquired a technical meaning, which does not belong to them in other parts of the Old Testament literature. The idea

that the same Hebrew word should always be rendered by one and the same word in English is the most foolish conceivable. The Old Testament is not a book, but a collection of books, separated from one another, in some cases, by a period of a thousand years. And the books belong to entirely different regions of thought and different kinds of literature, in which the same term may be used in senses quite distinct. The phraseology of the wisdom must be studied in the books of the wisdom, and renderings adopted suitable to this class of literature without much reference to those employed in other parts of the Bible. There is another thing also, which makes translation of the Proverbs difficult. The Hebrew proverbs, though not, like the proverbial literature of other countries, shrewd and pithy sayings originating in the mouths of the common people, but studied and lofty generalizations of an ethical kind on conduct and character, have still a considerable affinity to the ordinary popular proverb. The worn and patched form in which many of them have come down to us shows that they were much in the popular mouth, and had been transmitted from generation to generation orally before they took a written shape. The proverbial literature thus touches a lower stratum of the language than the more elevated prophetic style. The translator encounters a number of strange words, on which there is nothing to cast light except the connexion in which they stand, and occasionally also forms of diction very unfamiliar. Altogether the task of rendering the Proverbs adequately into another language is a delicate and difficult one. The contribution which the Revision has made may be accepted in the meantime as thankworthy.

A multitude of small but useful changes may be left to the reader himself to observe. The change of the vague "wisdom" into "wise dealing" (*v.* 3) is an improvement, though even "wise dealing" expresses only one aspect of

the thing intended, which is analysed into "righteousness, judgment, and equity." Syntax suggested the change in *v. 5*, of "a wise man will hear" into "that the wise man may hear," the imperf. being the variant of the preceding infin. In *v. 9*, "a chaplet of grace" is truer and has more colour than the general "ornament" of A.V. The phrase, "cast in thy lot among us" (*v. 14*), seems to mean in English, enter with us upon our enterprise and share its chances. The passage however is not an exhortation, but a promise of an equal share in the great spoil which is expected; hence R.V., "thou shalt cast thy lot among us," is better. Ver. 16, identical with Isaiah lix. 7, is not found in the Septuagint, and may be an interpolation of a marginal reference.

One object of the Proverbs, their editor tells us, is "to give subtilty to the simple" (*v. 4*). Nothing could be better fitted for this purpose than *v. 17*. R.V. renders:

For in vain is the net spread,  
In the eyes of any bird

With this comma, "in the eyes," etc., must mean, in the judgment or estimation of any bird; its judgment being that the net is spread in vain. This can only mean either, I am not to be caught; or, The net is harmless and without purpose, there is no danger in it. The latter sense does not do justice to the words "in vain." And upon the whole a bird's reflections are hardly to be expected here. The margin, with A.V., omits the comma. Read even in this way two senses are possible: either, It is vain to think to catch even birds, if you spread the net before their eyes: much more should you, my son, beware of a plain destruction lying before you; or, It is in vain that it is in their very sight that the net is spread, the foolish or greedy birds go into it nevertheless: and so these wicked men lay wait for their own blood, they go upon an enterprise which it may



be seen will be their own destruction. This last sense seems most suitable to the connexion.

The second clause of *v.* 26, "when your fear cometh," shows that R.V. did well to render the parallel clause "laugh in *the day of your calamity*" instead of "at your calamity" of A.V. The change of "the turning away of the simple" into "the backsliding," etc. (*v.* 32), is due no doubt to the desire for uniformity, but may appear of dubious advantage. The "simple" is the raw, unformed man, who can hardly backslide in the ordinary sense. What is his ruin is his refusal to turn to Wisdom (*v.* 23), or his turning away from her when she offers herself. He needs positive instruction, the sure testimony of the Lord, which maketh a wise man of the simple (Ps. xix. 7). The margin, "careless ease," for "prosperity," of fools is suggestive.

In iii. 3, the last clause, "write them upon the table of thine heart," is wanting in the Septuagint. With this clause the verse is a tristich, the only one in the chapter (*v.* 28 should probably be read as a distich); and the clause may have been added at a later time. In *v.* 10, "presses" has become "fats," a word which, when pronounced as spelled, is hardly understood. It would perhaps be a pity to lose the expression, "shame shall be the promotion of fools." The sense of the original is that given in the margin; while the wise inherit honour, fools carry away (as their portion, or acquisition) shame. The phrase in iv. 7, "with all thy getting get understanding," most naturally means, whatever else thou gettest get understanding. R.V. reads, "with all that thou hast gotten get," etc., which is somewhat ambiguous. It may mean, amidst all thou hast gotten, however much thou hast gotten, get, etc.; or, at the cost or price of all thou hast gotten.

Chap. v. 6 has been altered from the 2nd pers. masc. to the 3rd fem. (the two are alike in Heb.), and no doubt

rightly, the "strange woman" being subject. The verse is difficult, both on account of the uncertain meaning of the verb *palles*, and of the peculiar use of the conj. *pen*. A.V. renders "ponder"; etymologically clever, but scarcely right in usage. R.V. has introduced the idea of "level" into the passages where the verb occurs (*e.g.* iv. 26, v. 21), helping out the sense of the present verse by something of a circumlocution. R.V. reads *v.* 16 interrogatively. The Septuagint appears to have found a negative in the text before it, though early copies differ. The negative in Aquila is supposed to have been introduced from the Septuagint. If the negative be not introduced, there seems no help but to read the verse interrogatively with R.V.; for it is scarcely possible, with Delitzsch, to take the words, "let thy fountains be dispersed abroad," in the general sense, let them be abundant.

A distinct gain is the change of "make sure thy friend" (vi. 3) into "importune." The word "humble thyself" has been left, with margin "bestir thyself." Possibly a stronger word than "bestir" might have been justified even in the text. In *v.* 11, "one that travelleth" becomes "robber," with advantage to the sense; and in *v.* 16 syntax is propitiated by the small change of "these six" into "there be six things." In *v.* 29, "shall not be innocent" is corrected into "shall not be unpunished."

In vii. 11, "loud and stubborn" becomes "clamorous and wilful." The latter word is better than stubborn. The margin on "clamorous" is "turbulent," though neither word is very happy. The strange woman is not a scold. She probably never had a word with "the good man" all her life, except to shoot a sarcasm at him, which he was too dull to feel. Clamour and brawling are quite foreign to her character; on the contrary, she is close or guarded of heart (*v.* 10). The word applied to her in this verse means rather restless or unsettled, and may describe both the

unquiet impulses of her mind as well as her outward roving about (*v.* 12). In *v.* 20, "day appointed" is rightly changed into "full moon." The text of *v.* 22 is probably, as R.V. says, corrupt. A.V. has corrected it at its own hand. The suggestion of R.V. margin that "feters" may mean "one in fetters," the abstract being put for the concrete, as frequently in this book, though good, still leaves the verse rather unsatisfactory. In *v.* 26, "many strong men have been slain by her" is rightly altered into "all her slain are a mighty host."

In *viii.* 22, "the Lord possessed me" should no doubt be as the margin, "the Lord formed me." Whether "in the beginning" or "as the beginning" be read is of less consequence. In *v.* 30, "one brought up with him" becomes "a master workman," though the masc. term is less happy than might be wished when applied to the Wisdom, which is fem. R.V. retains "I was daily *his* delight," offering in the margin what it can hardly be doubted is the real meaning, "I had delight continually."

In *ix.* 13, R.V. margin on "the foolish woman" is, "or, Folly." Literally this would be, Woman Folly (Delitzsch, Frau Thorheit) or Madam Folly. Delitzsch reads: "Folly is restless, (she is) simplicity and knoweth nothing." This is not a natural construction. We might read: Folly is restless; Frivolity, she knoweth nothing, Frivolity being another name for Folly. It is possible that Frivolity in the second clause is subject of the whole verse, and that we should render:

A foolish woman, and restless  
Is Frivolity, and she knoweth nothing.

The passage *xiv.* 1 appears to be of the same kind as the present one, and the usual rendering of it can hardly be accepted.

In *x.* 3, "casteth away the substance" is rightly altered into "thrusteth away the desire of the wicked." Ver. 14,

“the mouth of the foolish is near destruction,” which is liable to be misunderstood, becomes “is a present destruction,” *i.e.* an instant downfall. The parallel clause is, “wise men lay up (rather, keep back, conceal, xii. 23) knowledge”; while this is the case, the mouth of the foolish blurts out its folly instantaneously, like the downcome of a clattering ruin. Consideration before speaking (xviii. 13) and reserve in speech is frequently recommended and praised in the Proverbs, and is the mark of the wise; as it is said in xx. 5, “counsel in the heart of man is like deep water, but a man of understanding will draw it out.” Probably the real sense of *v.* 22 is expressed by the margin, “toil addeth nothing thereto,” where A.V. has “he addeth no sorrow with it” (His blessing, which maketh rich). In *v.* 31, “the froward tongue shall be cut out” is altered into “cut off.” Probably the real meaning is “cut down,” the figure being that of a tree, as the parallel clause indicates.

In xi. 3, “perverseness of transgressors” is altered into “of the treacherous.” The latter word is the usual rendering of *boged*, though far from a happy one. It is often extremely difficult to say which is subject and which predicate in the nominal sentences of the proverbs. R.V. renders *v.* 12, “he that despiseth his neighbour is void of wisdom,” while A.V. reads in the opposite way, “he that is void of wisdom despiseth,” etc. A similar instance occurs in xii. 1, “whoso loveth correction loveth knowledge,” which would more naturally read “whoso loveth knowledge loveth correction,” which is the road to knowledge. Unquestionably R.V. is right in rendering xi. 30 “he that is wise winneth souls” (*i.e.* to himself), in opposition to A.V. “he that winneth souls is wise.” Another good change appears in *v.* 18, the wicked “earneth deceitful wages,” for “worketh a deceitful work” of A.V., the antithesis being “he that soweth righteousness hath a sure reward.”

In xii. 9 R.V. retains, better is he that is lightly esteemed "and hath a servant," which is the most natural rendering. Septuagint and Syriac render "and is servant to himself." This is less natural; better, by a change of vowels, "and laboureth, or tilleth, for himself." Ver. 12, "the wicked desireth the net (marg., prey) of evil men," is one of those verses where error may be justly suspected in the text. The clause has little meaning, and forms neither a parallel nor an antithesis to the other clause of the verse, "the root of the righteous yieldeth *fruit*"; though the sense of this clause also is uncertain. R.V. has altered *v.* 26 considerably; A.V., "the righteous is more excellent than his neighbour," becoming "the righteous is a guide to his neighbour." The doubtful word has been assumed to be a verb, one of those jussives that perplex the grammarian. The well-known sluggard who "roasteth not that which he took in hunting," and on whom Mr. Spurgeon's brief commentary was that "he *was* a lazy fellow," has his visage marred by the margin "catcheth not his prey" (*v.* 27). The excuse for this disappointing margin is found in Song ii. 9, where a word from what might be the same root is rendered "lattice," that is, presumably network or grating. Hence the root is supposed to mean to ensnare, catch with a net. This sense however is merely a presumption from the word in the Song, which may have no such specific sense as "net-work." On the other hand, the sense of "singeing" or burning is well assured from Chaldee and Syriac, though it must be confessed neither of these senses is quite the same as "roast." Schultens compared an Arabic root, signifying to rouse, set in motion; but we all know that to start our hare and to catch her are different things. The sluggard is often treated humorously in the Proverbs: he turns on his bed like a door on its hinges; he hideth his hand in his bosom, and will not bring it to his mouth again; and his dread of labour is revealed by his cry, "There is a



lion in the way, there is a lion in the streets!" Most of the proverbs in the earlier chapters of the great collection, chaps. x.-xxii., are antithetical, and it has been suspected that an antithesis originally lay in *v.* 28, the final words of second clause being "unto death" instead of "no death" (reading *el* for *ad*). No satisfactory reconstruction of the verse however has been proposed, though it may be admitted that it has a somewhat anomalous appearance. And to the argument that the great word No-death, or as we might say, Immortality, is not to be expected in a writing so early as the Proverbs, the answer is twofold: first, that the second clause does not appear to say more than the first; and, secondly, supposing it did say more, and said something not to be expected in an early writing, the solution of the difficulty is to be found not in evading its natural meaning, but rather in raising the question whether the codification of this division of the Proverbs be not comparatively late.

A decided gain is got from the change in R.V. xiii. 8, "the poor heareth no threatening," A.V. "rebuke." The sentiment is the Hebrew equivalent of the *cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator*. It is possible that the phrase "by labour," margin "with the hand" (*v.* 11), may have the post-biblical sense of "little by little." It is just expressions of the popular language during the classical period that we see survive and take a place in the literary language of a subsequent time. That xiv. 7 should be rendered "go into the presence" and "go from the presence of a foolish man," in text and margin respectively, might seem to indicate rare capabilities on the part of the Hebrew language, meriting the warm compliments paid to it by Professor Huxley. The Hebrew prep., like the Latin *a*, *ab*, expresses either position or motion,—go, so as to be in the presence of, or go from that position. The margin is more expressive, and is probably right for other reasons. The imperat. has a

hypothetical sense: Go (=if thou goest) from the presence of a foolish man, thou shalt not have perceived in him the lips of knowledge. This is one's experience of intercourse with a fool. The margin, to "make a mock at guilt," or, "the guilt offering" (*v.* 9) has no probability in its favour. The technicalities of the ritual are not to be expected in the Proverbs. It may be made a question indeed, whether the change of trespass-offering into guilt-offering will turn out advantageously. It is very difficult too to accept "shall be satisfied from himself" (*v.* 14). A slight change in the text, *me'alav* into *ma'alav*, the prep. being understood from the first clause, gives the needed sense: "and a good man (shall be satisfied) from his own doings" (*xx.* 11; so also in a good sense, *Ps.* *lxxvii.* 12, *lxxviii.* 7). A different text of *v.* 32 seems to have been before the Septuagint, which renders "in his holiness" for "in his death" (reading probably *tummo* for *motho*). The absolute use of the verb "hath hope" is unfamiliar, a thing which struck the Targumist, who renders, "he who hopeth that he shall die."

Chap. *xv.* 2 is one of a number of proverbs which extol apt or fine and beautiful speech. R.V. alters "useth" into "uttereth," which is more exact. The tongue of the wise not only utters knowledge, but does so beautifully, with refinement of language and manner; the mouth of fools poureth out folly. In such proverbs there is an antithesis in every word (see *v.* 23; *xxv.* 11: like apples of gold in pictures of silver is a word fitly spoken). Chap. *xvi.* 12 is rather ambiguous: "it is an abomination to kings to commit wickedness." In conformity with the meaning of "abomination of kings" the sense can only be that the commission of wickedness (by any one) under their rule is an abomination unto kings (*xxv.* 5). A good change has been introduced into *xvi.* 20, "he that giveth heed unto the word shall find good." The "word" or "commandment"

refers to the revelation of God, and is frequently alluded to in the Proverbs; *e.g.* vi. 23, xiii. 13, xix. 16. The A.V., "he that handleth a matter wisely," has found a place in the margin, with other lumber. Equally good is the change on *v.* 31, "the hoary head is a crown of glory; it shall be found (A.V., *if it be found*) in the way of righteousness." The teaching of the Proverbs is that the hoary head *is* found in the way of righteousness—the fear of the Lord prolongeth days, but the years of the wicked shall be shortened (*x.* 28).

The difficulty of distinguishing predicate from subject in these proverbial sentences is illustrated in xvii. 11 and 27, where alternative renderings are given in text and margin. The parallelism of the two members of a verse must not be too rigidly pressed, because, apparently for the sake of variety, the subject and predicate may be crossed in one of the members. Ver. 27 has been improved by substituting "he that is of a cool spirit" for "is of an excellent spirit." The sense of the fine saying, *v.* 17, is probably that given in the margin, "a friend loveth at all times, and he is born a brother (shows himself or becomes a born brother) in adversity" (*Job xi.* 12), not "a brother is born for adversity."

Chap. xviii. 1 has been completely altered, to the great advantage of the sense. In *v.* 8 "wounds" becomes "dainty morsels"; the word is obscure (*comp. xx.* 30; the proverb is repeated, *xxvi.* 22). And the same must be said of *v.* 24, where A.V. "must show himself friendly" is altered into "*doeth it* (makes friends) to his own destruction." Chap. xix. 7 is a tristich, and the third line can hardly be construed. It is probable that a line has fallen out, leading to early confusion of the text, which receives large amplifications in the Septuagint. The change in *v.* 18 is in the line of A.V. margin; "set not thy heart upon his destruction" is explained in another proverb, "if thou beat

him with the rod he shall not die" (xxiii. 13), *i.e.* chastisement will save the child from death. R.V. has made the meaning of A.V. clearer in *v.* 22 by a slight insertion, "the desire of a man is *the measure of his kindness*"; that is, his kindness is to be estimated according to his goodwill, not the amount of his gift: the parallel being, "a poor man (kind, though unable to help) is better than a liar" (rich, but denying ability). So the Septuagint helps out the sense of the second clause. It is very doubtful if the word "desire" can mean "will" or "goodwill." The Septuagint appears to have read a different word, which it renders "fruit," and various emendations of the text have been proposed. Ver. 27 is altered for the better, "cease to hear instruction, *only* to err from the words of knowledge"; A.V. "instruction *that causeth* to err." But "instruction" is technical in the Proverbs for wholesome discipline; the advice given is, Cease to hear instruction, if it is not to be followed.

The rendering xx. 1, "whosoever erreth thereby (strong drink) is not wise" is better than A.V. "whosoever is deceived." The word is rendered "ravished" chap. v. 19, *i.e.* transported or enraptured, and this probably comes near the meaning here. In xxi. 8, the word *vazar*, which A.V. assumed to be *zar* with the conj., and rendered "and strange," has been taken by R.V. to be a single word, akin to the Arabic root from which comes *wezir* (vizier) and translated "laden with guilt," after Schultens and others. The occurrence of this common Arabic root, though elsewhere altogether strange to Hebrew, is scarcely surprising in the Proverbs.

In chap. xxiii. 31, R.V. has changed with advantage "when it (the wine) moveth itself aright," into "when it goeth down smoothly." And in chap. xxiv. 16, "the wicked shall fall into mischief," which says little, becomes, "the wicked are overthrown by calamity," a good anti-

thesis to "the just man falleth seven times, and riseth again." In v. 26, "he kisseth the lips that giveth a right answer" is better than "*every man shall kiss his lips that giveth,*" etc.

The chapters xxv.-xxix. contain many of the most beautiful proverbs in the book. There is no reason to doubt the historical truth of the statement that they were copied out, that is, brought together from a number of smaller collections, by the men of Hezekiah. We have thus a guarantee for their comparative antiquity which we do not possess in regard to any other of the parts of our present book. These chapters probably form the oldest collection of proverbs existing. There may be many very ancient proverbs in the code chaps. x.-xxii., but as a collection it is probably of more recent date than the code chaps. xxv.-xxix. The occurrence of a number of the same proverbs in both collections leads to the conclusion that they were made independently of one another. The proverbs in the latter collection are simpler and less artificial and elaborate. The literary finish of those in chaps. x.-xxii. has usually been regarded as an evidence of their comparative antiquity, but it may more naturally be regarded as proof of their comparative lateness, when proverb-making had become a literary art. There are scarcely any traces of those terms which became technical in the Wisdom in the collection chaps. xxv.-xxix. For instance, the word "discipline" (*musar*) does not occur; nor "scorner" (*letz*), of whom a definition is even given xxi. 24; nor "doctrine" (*lekach*); nor "steersmanship" (*tachbuloth*, A.V. wise counsels); nor "discretion" or device (*mezimmah*): and even the words "knowledge," "wisdom," "understanding," etc., are rare, and hardly technical. Very many of the proverbs in this code are of the form of a comparison, which was probably the original type of the proverb, according to its name. Some of these comparisons are very fine: *e.g.* "fervent lips and a wicked



heart are like an earthen vessel overlaid with silver dross" (xxvi. 23); "a trampled fountain and a marred spring is the righteous man that giveth way to the wicked" (xxv. 26); "a city broken down and without walls is he whose spirit is without restraint" (xxv. 28). Most of the proverbs that have been naturalized in our own language belong to this small collection; *e.g.* "heap coals of fire upon his head" (xxv. 22), "iron sharpeneth iron" (xxiv. 17), "bray a fool in a mortar" (xxvii. 22), "the fear of man bringeth a snare" (xxix. 25), "the dog is returned to his vomit" (xxvi. 11), and many more.

The proverb xxv. 9 is a fine one, whatever be its precise sense. R.V. corrects the second clause rightly, "disclose not the secret of another," A.V. "to another." The rendering of first clause, "debate thy cause with thy neighbour *himself*," might suggest that the "other" whose secret is not to be disclosed is this neighbour. This is doubtful. The meaning is rather, Debate thy cause with thy neighbour (if necessary and by all means), but beware of revealing, for the sake of victory, the private matters of a third person. R.V. must be right in rendering *v.* 23 "the north wind bringeth forth rain," A.V. driveth away rain.

In xxvi. 7, "the legs of the lame hang loose," improves A.V. "are not equal." As the legs dangle from a lame man, and are ineffective for any purpose, so is a proverb in the mouth of fools. Another verse says that a fool's handling of a proverb is so awkward, that he does himself a mischief with it (*v.* 9). In *v.* 8 a doubtful sense has been replaced by a sense not less doubtful, while *v.* 10 remains a veritable puzzle. A.V. followed as usual the Jewish interpreters, "the great *God* that formed all things," etc.; its rendering of the second clause, "both rewardeth the fool and rewardeth transgressors," lacks support in the usage of the language whether for the sense "reward" or for

“transgressors.” R.V. has adopted the meaning proposed by Ewald, “an archer (*rab*, plur. Jer. l. 29) wounding all, so is he that hireth the fool and he that hireth them that pass by.” Bickell amends the text thus: As an archer wounding all (the passers by), so is he that hireth the fool and the drunken (reading *shikkor* for *soker*).

Chap. xxvii. 16 gains in clearness by the change of “hideth” into “restraineth.” The second clause, “his right hand encountereth oil,” that is, something which he cannot lay hold of, is certainly more suitable than A.V. “the ointment of his right hand which bewrayeth itself.” Syntactically the words read, “and oil meeteth his right hand,”—when he puts it out in the attempt to restrain the contentious woman. Ver. 21 contains a fine proverb, though it is a little obscure. R.V. helps out the sense by a slight insertion: “The fining pot is for silver, . . . and a man is *tried* by his praise,” the margin “that which he praiseth,” being almost explanatory. This gives a good sense: that which a man esteems highest, or that in which he considers his honour or worth to lie, is the test of his character. A somewhat simpler sense is obtained by taking “his praise” objectively, that bestowed on him by others.

Chap. xxix. 8, “scornful men set a city in a flame,” is both more correct and more vigorous than A.V., “bring a city into a snare.” Ver. 18 is also improved: “where there is no vision the people cast off restraint,” A.V. “the people perish.” “Vision” is prophetic revelation, and the proverb must belong to the age of the prophets. The sense of v. 21 is doubtful in the second clause, as R.V. margin acknowledges, owing to the unknown word *manon*, rendered “a son.” The word is supposed to be allied to *nin*, rendered “son”; e.g. Gen. xxi. 23, Job xviii. 19.

The first words of chap. xxx. are very obscure. The

alternative sense supplied by the margin has very much to be said for it. There being no vowels in the MSS., and the letters being written consecutively, in former times, without division into words, it is quite possible that a wrong division may have arisen. The Hebrew text reads *leithiel* as one word, meaning, "unto Ithiel"; the margin divides into two words, *laithi el*, "I have wearied myself, O God." In like manner for *veukal*, "and Ucal," the margin points *vaekel*, "and am consumed."

In *v.* 28, the sense "lizard" for "spider" is pretty well assured. The "greyhound" in *v.* 31 is less certain. The remaining words of the verse are obscure. The text, "against whom there is no rising up," assumes that the words *al kâm* are the neg. and the infin. "to rise." Such a connexion of the neg. with the infin. is suspicious (though comp. Ps. xxxii. 9). The margin considers *alkôm* to be Arabic, "the people," *al* being the art. as in algebra, alkoran, etc. The proverbs in this chapter profess to be drawn from a foreign, unisraelitish source. Geiger discovered Alkimus, of the Maccabæan period, in this passage, rendering, "and king Alkimus, who corresponds to him" (the he goat). The work of amending the text of the Old Testament is a very perilous one; all those who engage in it sooner or later become bereft of their reason.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

---

## BREVIA.

## Fellowship with God.

“And this is the message which we have heard from Him, and announce unto you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin.”—1 JOHN i. 5-7 (Rev. Ver.).

IN translating *μετ' ἀλλήλων* as in the A.V.—“one with another”—I cannot but think that the Revisers missed an opportunity of giving the true sense of this passage—a sense as precious as it seems to me to be the obvious one. At the same time, since Dr. Westcott, who was so valuable a member of the Revision Company, has given us in his *Epistles of St. John* his reason for rejecting the sense which I shall hope to shew is the true one, and for retaining that of the A.V., perhaps we should not wonder that the Revisers fell in with it.

That the Infinite and the finite could hold direct communication the one with the other seemed to the dreamy but religious mind of the East impossible. Yet earnest souls yearned after such fellowship. Hence those Gnostic fancies—varying in form, but one in origin and aim—of a gradation of intermediate intelligences, reaching from the nearest to the Unapproachable down to those in touch with mortal man, and through whom some kind of communion might become possible. That such dreams had begun to tell, or at least were in danger of telling, upon the Christians of proconsular Asia, in whose capital the beloved disciple spent his last days, is beyond question: and as if he felt that to them he had a message pre-eminently fitted to meet that subtle danger, and was brimming over with it as “the present truth” for that region, he opens with it, in one prolonged paragraph extending to the end of the first chapter. And what is it? It is nothing less than *the Incarnation of the Eternal Word*, in virtue of which that “Eternal Life, which was with the Father,” could be “heard,” and had been heard, by human ears; could be “seen”—for “we have seen” Him “with our eyes,” and we “have looked upon Him”;—nay, could be handled, for “our hands have handled” that “Word

of life"; and "the Life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the Eternal Life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." Well, "that which we have seen and heard" is what we now "declare unto you." To what end? "That ye also may have fellowship with us." But what good will that do us? Much every way, for "our fellowship is with the Father (the Fountain of it), and with His Son Jesus Christ (the glorious Channel of it)."

*Fellowship with God*, then—that wonderful, and to the Oriental mind seemingly impossible, thing, in order to which no intermediate agency is either required or permitted, a fellowship as near as the flesh of the Incarnate One is to our flesh—that is the fellowship which we enjoy. And since this is too good to keep to ourselves, we want you to share in it and enjoy it along with us. But observe the *conditions* of it. For this other message we have from Him and announce to you, "that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. If (then) we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." For from the very nature of fellowship, it cannot exist where there is no sympathy between the parties. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" As like draws to like, so opposites repel one another. "But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship"—with whom? with our fellow Christians? Who would ever expect such a sequence? Our fellow Christians are not in the question now before the writer and his readers. The two parties here are *God* and *we*, and the question is how these two parties have mutual fellowship. Negatively first: "If we walk in darkness, while He is light, we cannot have it, and if we say we have it, we lie"; but now positively, "If we walk in the light, as He is the light, we do have this fellowship." Clearly, therefore, the words should be rendered, "we have fellowship together;" or if that be thought not dignified enough, "we have fellowship one with the other":—as Dr. Pope (in Schaff's *Commentary*) expresses it, "our fellowship with God is then not a lie but a reality."

Now what is Dr. Westcott's objection to this? "The supposition that *μετ' ἀλλήλων* means 'we with God and God with us' is against the apostolic form of language (John xx. 17), and also against the general form of St. John's argument, for he takes the fellowship of Christians as the visible sign and correlative of fellowship with



God (iv. 7, 12; comp. iii. 11, 23).” With submission, I think each of these statements is incorrect.<sup>1</sup>

1. So far from its being “against the apostolic form of language” to speak of “our having fellowship with God and God with us,” a bolder form of language than this is put into the mouth of our Lord Himself by this same apostle when he was “in the spirit on the Lord’s day”:—“Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me” (Rev. iii. 20) Observe how each of the parties is specified here distributively—“I with him, and he with Me.” That we should be able to sup with Him, high as that is, we could understand. But that He should sup with us is a word so high, as *Bengel* would say, that we could not dare to utter it if He Himself had not done it for us. Yet what is it after all but what He said to the disciples at the well of Samaria, after His interview with that poor woman which was to issue in the Samaritans themselves being drawn to Him? They had all that time been “away into the city to buy food,” and on their return they said, “Master, eat. But He said unto them, I have meat to eat that ye know not of.” In truth, what can “our fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ” mean, if it be not what all fellowship of necessity is—mutual? and is it not a little finical (*pace* my honoured friend) to hold that, though the general idea of the thing is allowable, the specification of each of the two parties is irreverent, or not in the Johannine style?

2. This view of the passage is said to be “against the general form of St. John’s argument, who takes the fellowship of Christians as the visible sign and correlative of fellowship with God.” This is to me, I confess, a surprising objection. That in the sequel of this epistle he does treat of the fellowship of Christians with each other, as the outcome and reflection of their fellowship with God, is abundantly clear. But the question is, Is that what he is treating of here? Certainly not. What he is dealing with here is the fellowship *out of which* that other fellowship flows. I

<sup>1</sup> I hardly think it necessary to refer to the passage in John xx. 17, as if that could have any proper bearing on our passage. On the eve of His ascent to that higher sphere in which the old familiarities would be utterly unsuitable, the Lord gently checks it, when Mary is transported at seeing Him once more alive, by sharply marking out the difference between *His* relation to God and the Father and *ours*.

want you (he says) to have fellowship with us in that fellowship which *we* have with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ; and therefore to say that "this high mutual fellowship" is not what  $\mu\epsilon\tau'$  ἀλλήλων means, but that *secondary reflection* of it in the fellowship of Christians with each other, which is *afterwards* spoken to, is, in Dr. Westcott, a little surprising.

DAVID BROWN.

P.S.—Dr. Plummer, in his elaborate and most excellent edition of the *Epistles of St. John* (in the "Cambridge Series for Schools"), not only takes Dr. Westcott's view of the passage which has given occasion to this paper, but holds it "certain" that this is the true sense. But as he only repeats Dr. Westcott's arguments, I need add nothing to what I have written.

---

SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF  
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

VI. LIGHT UPON THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. CONCLUSION.

1. WE have already noticed summarily the singular clearness with which Greek distinguishes between a fact regarded simply as past and a past fact regarded in relation to the present, by the use of the aorist and the perfect respectively. We do not habitually mark the distinction so sharply in English, though the language is perfectly able to do so, and the A.V. furnishes abundant precedents to justify the exact expression of the difference in every kind of connexion. At the same time the constant and almost consistent use of the aorist in the R.V. occasions on first hearing an impression of harshness; and the reader is required not unfrequently to exercise some patient reflection before he realises the corresponding gain. Yet, to take a general illustration, it is obvious that while it is equally true to say of men in regard to the efficacy of the work of Christ, "ye were saved," "ye have been saved," "ye are (are being) saved," the forms of thought suggested by the three tenses are perfectly distinct, and ought to be represented in a faithful translation. So we now read in Rom. viii. 24, *By hope were we saved* (not *we are saved by hope*); and thus we are reminded that the thought of the Apostle goes back to the critical moment when the glorious prospect of the gospel made itself felt in the heart of the believer with transforming power. And again, 2 Tim. i. 8, *Suffer hardship with the gospel according to the power of God, who saved*

us . . . (not *who hath saved us . . .* ; comp. Tit. iii. 5, A.V.). On the other hand, in Eph. ii. 5, 8, St. Paul insists on the present efficacy of the past Divine work: *God . . . when we were dead . . . quickened us together with Christ*—there is the decisive fact: *by grace have ye been saved*—there is the continuous action of that one vivifying change. The use of the present is even more significant. When we read in A.V. *the preaching of the cross . . . (is) unto us which are saved . . . the power of God* (1 Cor. i. 18), it is almost impossible not to regard salvation as complete; but the very aim of the Apostle is to press home upon his readers the thought of a progressive work wrought out under the living power of the gospel: *The word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness; but unto us which are being saved it is the power of God.* And so again in 2 Cor. ii. 15, *We are a sweet savour of Christ unto God, in them that are being saved, and in them that are perishing.* The same rendering in Acts ii. 47, *The Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved*, no doubt lacks neatness, but it avoids the false suggestion of A.V., *such as should be saved*, and brings the rendering of an unusual phrase into harmony with the rendering in other places.

2. It will be evident from what has been said, that the force of the Greek aorist is nowhere more expressive in the New Testament than when it is used to describe the ideal completeness of Christ's work for man. No reader who weighs the words can fail to feel the difference between *walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us* (Eph. v. 2, A.V.), and *walk in love, as Christ also loved you, and gave Himself up for us* (R.V.). In the latter rendering, which reproduces the form of the Greek, the Divine purpose is shown to us in its essential fulfilment from the side of God. In the historic life and death of Christ there is the perfect revelation of love absolutely accomplished: *He is our peace, who made both one, and brake*

down the middle wall of partition (Eph. ii. 14; not, as A.V., *hath made, hath broken down*).

This cardinal thought, by which our minds are concentrated on the historic work of the Incarnate Word, is presented in many lights. It is an encouragement in the fulfilment of our work. The presbyters at Miletus are charged *to feed the Church of God, which He purchased* (not *hath purchased*) *with His own blood* (Acts xx. 28). Those whom they have to serve are already the property of God; and the Christian pastor has the historic assurance of the fact when he looks to the Cross. And so, under the same image, it is said of Christians: *Ye are not your own; for ye were bought* (not *ye are bought*) *with a price* (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23); and again in Christ *we were made a heritage* (Eph. i. 11). Thus the consciousness of blessing becomes also a motive to labour: *Be ye kind one to another, St. Paul writes, . . . forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave* (not *hath forgiven*) *you* (Eph. iv. 32). And he speaks of his own efforts as answering to one sovereign act of the Lord: *I press on, if so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was* (not *am*) *apprehended by Christ Jesus* (Phil. iii. 12).

A fresh element is added to the conception when we read that *God . . . reconciled us to Himself through Christ* (2 Cor. v. 18); that *the Father . . . made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love* (Col. i. 12 f); that *Christ Jesus . . . was made* (not *is made, A.V.*) *unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption* (1 Cor. i. 30). And so we pass to the other side of the truth, which presents the change in the individual believer as accomplished once for all: *Such were some of you: but ye were* (not *are*) *washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our*



God (1 Cor. vi. 11; comp. Rom. viii. 30, A.V.). In this sense we are enabled to draw near to God, and for this end the Son of man, *Jesus*, . . . *dedicated for us a new and living way, through the veil* (Heb. x. 20).<sup>1</sup>

3. This is one aspect. There is another complementary aspect. That which Christ did and suffered, completely, absolutely, from the historic point of sight, abides unchangeably in its virtue. All that He experienced in His earthly life still remains as a present power for our salvation. Thus we read now in Heb. iv. 15, *We have a high priest . . . that hath been in all points tempted like as we are . . .* The temptation is not only a past fact (*was tempted*, A.V.), but even now an effectual reality (comp. vii. 28; ii. 18, A.V.).

So again, in the original, the Crucifixion of Christ is spoken of in 1 Cor. i. 23 as having a present reality, though it seemed impossible to convey the thought in a popular English version (*a Christ that hath been crucified*). But the corresponding relation of the believer to Christ is given exactly in Gal. ii. 20; *I have been* (not *I am*) *crucified with Christ*.

This use of the perfect is very impressive in 1 Cor. xv. In that chapter with one natural exception (*v.* 15), the Resurrection of Christ is uniformly spoken of as an event which has a continuous power. The message of the Apostle is "Christ hath been raised," not simply "Christ was raised." The risen Christ lives, in virtue of His rising, with all the fruits of His victory, as the Saviour of men. The very strangeness of the language, as strange in Greek as in English, must arrest attention when we read: *I delivered unto you, . . . that Christ died . . . ; and that He was buried : and that He hath been raised ; . . . and that He appeared to*

<sup>1</sup> A study of the use of the aorists in the last discourses of the Lord in the Gospel of St. John, as I have noticed before, suggests many thoughts of deep interest (*e.g.* chap. xiii. 31 marg.). We may notice, for example, in chap. xvii. aorists in *vv.* 2, 3, 4, 6 (so A.V.), 8, 14, 18, 21, 25, 26, and perfects in *vv.* 2, 4, 22.

*Cephas* . . . (v. 3 f; comp. vv. 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20); and even a slight pause is sufficient to allow the vivid image of the present Lord to make itself felt in place of the simple record of the fact. So also in 2 Tim. ii. 8, the only other passage where the form is used of the Lord, the same idea is indicated by the translation: *Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead*, in place of *Remember that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead*. The latter words simply recall the incident of the Resurrection; the former bring before the mind the figure of the living Christ.<sup>1</sup>

4. The redemption of men is referred, as we have seen, under one aspect, to the historic work of Christ, past and complete. There is a corresponding description of the position of the Christian. His redemption is connected with a historic fact in his life. *As many of you*, St. Paul says to the Galatians, *as were (not have been) baptized into Christ did (not have) put on Christ* (Gal. iii. 27); and again to the Corinthians: *in one Spirit were (not are) we all baptized into one body* (1 Cor. xii. 13). For him ideally, on the Divine side, all is done. His historic incorporation into Christ included potentially whatever is wrought out little by little in the conflict of time. The Death and Resurrection and Life of Christ, with whom he is united, are in a true sense his also.

Thus we read, in regard to Christ's death, *We thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died* (2 Cor. v. 14).

*We have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were holden* (Rom. vii. 6; comp. vi. 6 f).

*If ye died with Christ, . . . why . . . do ye subject yourselves to ordinances?* (Col. ii. 20.)

*Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God* (Col. iii. 3).

*Faithful is the saying, For if we died with Him, we shall also live with Him* (2 Tim. ii. 11).

<sup>1</sup> Compare for other examples II. § 8.

And in regard to His Burial and Resurrection St. Paul says,—

*We were buried with Him through baptism into death; and then, with a most significant change of tense, If we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His Resurrection* (Rom. vi. 5 f).

*In Him ye are made full: . . . having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead* (Col. ii. 12 ff).

*When we were dead . . . [God] quickened us together with Christ, . . . and raised us up with Him* (Eph. ii. 5 f).

*If then ye were raised with Christ . . .* (Col. iii. 1).

5. This truth of the mystical union of the believer with Christ finds its simplest and most complete expression in the Pauline phrase “in Christ,” which is itself a full gospel. This phrase, it will be felt at once, corresponds with the formula of baptism, *We were baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost* (Matt. xxviii. 19, R.V.), and in virtue of that act we are “in Christ.”

The phrase, which is a charter of life and union and strength, has been frequently rendered with exactness in the A.V.; but in many memorable passages it has been obscured, to the great loss of the English reader. When, for example, we read in Rom. vi. 23, *the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord*, we recognise a general description of the work of Christ, of what He has wrought for us, standing apart from us. But all is filled with a new meaning when the original is closely rendered: *the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord*. Life is not an endowment apart from Christ: it is Himself, and enjoyed in Him. *I am*, He Himself said, *the Way, and the Truth, and the Life. We are alive unto God, not only through Christ Jesus* (A.V.), but *in Christ Jesus*

(Rom. vi. 11 ; contrast John xv. 5, *apart from Me*). We seek therefore *to be justified*, not only *by Christ*, but *in Christ* (Gal. ii. 17) ; the blessing of Abraham came upon the Gentiles, not simply by the agency of Christ, *through Christ Jesus*, but *in Christ Jesus* (Gal. iii. 14).

Three additional examples, taken from a single chapter, where the force of the preposition has been obscured in A.V., will show how the truth thus distinctly expressed becomes a spring of peace and power and mature growth :

*The peace of God*, St. Paul writes, *which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in (through, A.V.) Christ Jesus* (Phil. iv. 7).

*I can do all things in (through, A.V.) Him that strengtheneth me* (Phil. iv. 13).

*My God shall fulfil every need of yours according to His riches in glory in (by, A.V.) Christ Jesus* (Phil. iv. 19).

And here it may be noticed that as man receives "in Christ" the fulness of Divine blessing, so God fulfils "in Christ" His purpose of salvation. Thus He showed *the exceeding riches of His grace in kindness to us in (through, A.V.) Christ Jesus* (Eph. ii. 7). *Be ye kind one to another, St. Paul writes, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ (A.V., for Christ's sake) forgave you* (Eph. iv. 32 ; comp. 2 Cor. v. 19, A.V.).<sup>1</sup>

6. But the relation of the believer to Christ, which has been historically established, has to be realised and maintained. Everything, as we have seen, is done by Christ once for all ; and still man is required freely to make his own that which has been won for him. The change of a single word brings out the responsibility of man from the first. Thus, when we read in Acts iii. 19, *Repent ye, and be converted*, the passive form of the second clause puts out of sight the thought of man's willing action, which lies in

<sup>1</sup> Other examples which deserve consideration are found in Rom. xv. 13, 17 ; Gal. ii. 20 ; Eph. ii. 22.

the original *Repent ye, and turn again*—"turn" with a glad response to the Divine voice which you have recognised. So the charge to St. Peter in Luke xxii. 32 receives its full force in R.V., *Do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren.*

But man does not originate the force which he uses. He can do nothing "of himself." He makes his own, as has been said, what Christ has done. This truth finds a striking expression in Col. iii. 35, *Ye died: . . . mortify therefore . . .* The one death in Christ makes each subsequent victory possible.

Under this aspect, the advance of the Christian is likened to a natural growth: *If we have become united with Him [Christ] by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His resurrection* (Rom. vi. 5). The power of the risen Christ will reveal itself in those who are one with Him.

In another passage this gradual transformation is presented under a different figure. It has been often said that we grow like those with whom we live; and so St. Paul writes, *We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory* (2 Cor. iii. 18). The rendering here indeed is not certain; but even if we adopt the marginal translation, *beholding as in a mirror* (A.V.) the main conception is the same. The believer grows like the Lord whom he intently contemplates.

7. This truth of the transforming power of the faith is affirmed in the Epistle to the Romans with singular force. In place of the words, *that form of doctrine which was delivered to you* (vi. 17), we must read, *that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered.* Our creed is indeed our sovereign lord, which fashions our character; and therefore we read, *Every one when he is perfected (not that is perfect) shall be as his Master* (Luke vi. 40). Since this is so, we can understand the full significance of the words with



which the Lord closes His long line of parables. "We are disciples to the kingdom of heaven"; we are not simply "instructed into it," but placed under its sway; and *every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old* (Matt. xiii. 52). The thought is of wide application, and finds its ultimate expression in a most remarkable passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians: *Everything that is made manifest is light* (Eph. v. 13). All that bears the light shares the nature of the light, and becomes in its turn a centre of illumination.<sup>1</sup>

8. In correspondence with this view of man's life, as brought little by little nearer to its ideal, it is important to preserve the exact force of those passages in which the Divine action is described as present; as, for example, 1 Thess. i. 10, *Jesus, which delivereth* (not *delivered*) *us from the wrath to come*; 1 Thess. ii. 12, *Walk worthily of God, who calleth* (not *hath called*) *you*—with a call answering to every changing circumstance of life—*into His own kingdom and glory*, words which find an echo at the close of the epistle, where they are rightly rendered in A.V., *Faithful is He that calleth you, who will also do it* (v. 24). And in this connexion we can feel the full meaning of Heb. ii. 16, *For not of angels doth He take hold* [to help], *but He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham*. The hand once laid on the believer (Phil. iii. 12) stills rests upon him with sustaining power. "Notice," Chrysostom says on John i. 29, "he does not say, 'The Lamb which will take,' or 'which took,' but 'which taketh the sins [so he wrongly quotes] of the world,' as always doing this."

<sup>1</sup> In this connexion a change may be noticed, which depends on a change of reading, of which the full meaning may easily be overlooked: *The old things are passed away; behold, they* (A.V. *all things*) *are become new* (2 Cor. v. 17). The joy of the thought lies in the assurance that the old is not lost, but transfigured.

9. Such changes as have been already noticed give us a clearer and more consistent view than was offered before of the essential relations of the Christian to God. It follows necessarily that not a few features in his life are brought out now with fresh distinctness.

One word, which was mistranslated in A.V. in two critical passages, marks the Christian life as a continuous conquest. *This is the will of God*, St. Paul writes to the Thessalonians, . . . *that each one of you know how to possess himself of (not to possess, A.V.) his own vessel in sanctification and honour. . . .* (1 Thess. iv. 3 f). *In your patience*, such was the Lord's promise to the disciples in the prospect of the overthrow of all they held to be most sacred, *ye shall win (not possess) your souls* (Luke xxi. 19). Even that which seems to be most our own, our bodies and our souls, must be won.<sup>1</sup>

They must be won, but not by our own strength. The Apostle's command is not, as we are accustomed to read it, *Be strong*, but, *Be strengthened* (2 Tim. ii. 1). Abraham in the trial of his faith *waxed strong*, "was strengthened," and not simply *was strong* (Rom. iv. 20; comp. Eph. vi. 10 marg.). And in the prospect of this Divine help, nothing short of a Divine ideal is set before us. The prayer of St. Paul is that the Lord would direct the hearts of the Thessalonians *into the love of God, and the patience of (not patient waiting for) Christ* (2 Thess. iii. 5). The charge of St. Peter to the elders is that they should *tend the flock of God, . . . not of constraint, but willingly, according unto God* (1 Pet. v. 2). And St. John speaks of *love made perfect with us (not our love made perfect: 1 John iv. 17)*, as man responds to the inspiration of God.

10. Viewed therefore from another side, the advancing victory of the believer is the advancing power of the

<sup>1</sup> Compare V. § 7.

revelation of Christ over him. When this is checked there is fatal danger. *Ye seek to kill Me*, the Lord said to the Jews, *because My word hath not free course* (not *no place*, A.V.) *in you* (John viii. 37). And the thought finds a characteristic expression in the paradox of St. Paul already quoted,<sup>1</sup> where he offers thanks to God, not *which always causeth us to triumph in Christ*, but *which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ* (2 Cor. ii. 14). His joy was that of a soul wholly surrendered to a sovereign conqueror.

11. We can understand therefore that while the Christian is stirred by a generous "ambition" in the conflict of life, his ambition is widely different from that of the world. *We make it our aim* (we are ambitious, marg.), St. Paul writes, . . . *to be well-pleasing unto [the Lord]*" (2 Cor. v. 9); . . . *making it my aim* (being ambitious, marg.) *so to preach the gospel, not where Christ was already named* (Rom. xv. 20). And the term points an expressive paradox when we read in 1 Thess. iv. 11 (marg.), *be ambitious to be quiet, and to do your own business*. If the progress of the Christian is "without rest," it is also "without haste." Few changes of reading give a more remarkable thought than that in 2 John 9 (*προάγων* for *παραβαίνων*): *Who-soever goeth onward* (A.V. *transgresseth*) *and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God*. To advance over-eagerly and to hang back are alike violations of duty.

12. Life as it is on earth necessarily includes suffering, and in several passages light is thrown by R.V. upon the discipline of pain. The rendering of Heb. xii. 7, which represents the addition of a single letter in the Greek text, furnishes a good illustration of the kind. At first sight A.V. seems to give a more natural thought (*If ye endure chastening . . .*); but a little reflection will show how important it is to bring out that patient endurance converts the pain into a beneficent lesson: *It is for chastening that*

<sup>1</sup> Compare V. § 2.

*ye endure.* The fact is assumed and explained. And so a few verses after the apostolic writer marks the permanent effects of chastening: *it yieldeth peaceable fruit unto them that have been exercised* (not *are exercised*, A.V.) *thereby, even the fruit of righteousness* (xii. 11). At the same time we are taught in several places to recognise more plainly than before the intensity of the trial which must be endured and made a source of blessing. *False Christs . . . shall show signs, . . . that they may lead astray, if possible* (A.V. *if it were possible*), *the elect* (Mark xiii. 22): even this extreme result is not excluded. *Abraham without being weakened in faith considered* (A.V. *considered not*) *his own body now as good as dead* (Rom. iv. 19). The patriarch made a true estimate of the natural impossibility of the event for which he looked. *Look carefully how ye walk*, is St. Paul's command (Eph. v. 15). Every step must be determined beforehand with wise calculation.

13. There is necessarily another side to the thought of Christian progress. In correspondence with the growth of the Christian there is also the possibility of deterioration. There can be no moral stationariness. This law is recognised in Eph. iv. 22: *Put away . . . the old man, which waxeth* (A.V. *is*) *corrupt after the lusts of deceit*; Rev. xxii. 11: *He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness* (A.V. *be unjust*) *still*: *and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy* (A.V. *be filthy*) *still*: *and he that is righteous, let him do righteousness* (A.V. *be righteous*) *still*: *and he that is holy, let him be made holy* (A.V. *be holy*) *still*. And we can better understand the peril of the Hebrews when we read (v. 11), *Ye are become dull.* Their fault was not one of nature, but of neglect. They had failed to go forward, and so they had degenerated.

14. The fulfilment of this law reveals the Divine law of retribution. The sin becomes its own punishment. Men receive what they wrought, *the things done in the*

*body* (2 Cor. v. 10; comp. Eph. vi. 8). Thus we read (Col. iii. 25, marg.), *He that doeth wrong shall receive again the wrong that he hath done*; and a most difficult passage of the Second Epistle of St. Peter gains an impressive meaning by the help of this thought: *These . . . shall in their destroying surely be destroyed, suffering wrong as the hire of wrong-doing* (2 Pet. ii. 12 f). It cannot be otherwise. *Sin*, St. John says, *is lawlessness* (1 John iii. 4), and not, as A.V., *the transgression of the law*, a phrase which by its definiteness obscures the real significance of the original words. "Sin" and "lawlessness" ("violation of law") are convertible terms. Law is the expression of the will of God for us in regard to ourselves, to our fellow men, to creation, to God Himself. To transgress this in any direction is to sin, and so to realise just so far the will of God against us.

Here our inquiry comes naturally to an end. The illustrations which have been given in this section show the general effect of small corrections, which have been hitherto noticed in isolated details, upon large views of the Faith. They will enable the student to see how fundamental truths are presented by the Revision with a force and consistency unattained before. They will therefore, as I trust, be sufficient to guide him to the most important use of it. He will be encouraged to bring together for himself the familiar passages in which he has been accustomed to find the outlines of apostolic teaching, and then to consider how they are affected by new renderings, which he will at least have learnt to interrogate with intelligent patience. As he does this, diligently investigating (for example) what is set before us in the New Testament on the Person and Work of Christ, or on the position and destiny of man, his own experience will teach him to look with something more than suspicion upon the criticisms of



scholars who appear to find nothing better than solemn music in the English version of words of life, and to admit no hope of riper knowledge from the discipline of two centuries and a half. In any case, he will recognise that he must bring self-control and reverence to an inquiry which reminds us at every step of the feebleness of our own thoughts; and, if any particular results prove disappointing, he will draw strength from the modest endeavour to gain a clearer vision even of one fragment of the truth.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

## MALACHI.

### I.

TURNING from the autobiography of Nehemiah to the brier and pointed utterances of Malachi, we readily recognise that they were contemporaries. The abuses which Nehemiah strove to correct, the neglect of the Temple service and the mixed marriages, are the prevalent scandals against which the indignant denunciations of the prophet are directed. He would seem to have stood in the same relation to Nehemiah as Haggai and Zechariah occupied towards Zerubbabel, and to have uttered the closing words of Old Testament prophecy about the year 430 B.C. Of his personal history so little is known that it is even doubted whether any prophet of the name of Malachi ever lived. For, singularly enough, the word "Malachi" occurs in the first verse of the third chapter, where it is translated "my messenger," being necessarily accepted in that verse as an official, not a personal name. This title was not an unknown one, nor was it of novel application to the prophets of Jehovah, for we find Haggai speaking of himself (i. 13) as "Jehovah's messenger." Accordingly it is an old tradition among the

Jews, favoured in modern times by so sagacious a critic as Calvin, that this prophet was no other than Ezra himself. But as it was certainly usual for the Hebrew prophet to give his own name in the title of his prophecies, the probability is that Malachi was the personal name of him who uttered these words.

If then Malachi prophesied between the first and second visits of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, the degeneration of the people must have been very rapid. Nehemiah had provided a national endowment for upholding religious services. In Malachi's day, immediately after this compulsory endowment, everything was venal. All voluntary, generous service, such as Nehemiah himself had freely rendered, was at an end. A hireling spirit was apparent in priests and worshippers alike. The people brought their sacrifices; but such beasts were never seen in the market. Lame, blind, wretched skeletons that they would not have dared to offer to the Persian governor, disgraced the Temple courts. The priests, on their side, let it be seen that they performed their functions merely for the sake of the pay attached. These cheap offerings and heartless services met with the reception usually accorded to such services: the Lord declared, "I have no pleasure in you, neither will I accept an offering at your hand."

Nehemiah had also done his utmost to put a stop to mixed marriages. But the very correction of this abuse had introduced practices still more detrimental to morals. The precise form of the sin against which Malachi feels himself called to protest is, groundless divorce. "The Lord hateth putting away." "The Lord is witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously." This is susceptible of either of two interpretations. It may be aimed at the man who had been attracted by the beauty of an alien, and, in order to marry her, had divorced his Hebrew wife. Or he may be

rebuking those who took advantage of Nehemiah's reform to divorce foreign wives who had adopted the religion of Israel. In any case the abuse which Malachi so vigorously denounced was precisely that which to this day brings misery into thousands of households in the East—facile divorce. In Egypt a man may change his wife as often as he pleases. He has but to pronounce a form of words, and the woman must return to her parents. It is easy to believe what residents in Egypt tell us—that this liability to unmerited divorce produces misery and destitution among the women, profligacy and hard-heartedness among the men. Malachi unmasks the treachery and baseness of such offenders, and reminds them that what strikes the eye of God when He looks upon them is the misery of these broken-hearted women. When they came into His presence with their petitions for prosperity, it was this vile oppression that seemed to God to call most loudly for redress.

But in the first words which Malachi utters he pierces to the root of all immorality in their life: they had lost faith in God's love, and had assumed towards Him an attitude of sullen hostility or indifference. "I have loved you. Yet ye say, Wherein hast Thou loved us?" This was God's controversy with them. This was what grieved Him, that He was misunderstood. A parent is not hopeless about his child, though his orders are forgotten or even disobeyed. But when he sees his child settling down into a sullen, hostile attitude towards him, he is roused to bitter complaint and grief. Deeper far than all outward transgression lies this alienation of heart.

Considering what human nature is, it was not unlikely that many in Jerusalem should question God's love. Is it, they might say, evidence of love, that, after being for seventy years in slavery to a cruel people, we should be suffered to return to freedom, only that we might the more keenly feel our own feebleness? Is it evidence of God's

love, that we have been left all these years exposed to the scorn, violence, and robbery of troops of Samaritans and Ammonites? When our harvests are swept away by armed bands of marauders, when our seed is washed out of the ground by unseasonable rains, or rendered useless by parching droughts, when we have to listen to our children crying for bread, and see their lips blue with famine, are we to find in these things evidence of God's love? Our fathers returned to this land, encouraged to expect the blessing of God in it: where is that blessing?

Such is the sullen unbelief which often possesses the soul when God's love is not shown in precisely the ways we expect and desire. As with Israel, so with us all; there are times when everything seems to go wrong with us, when a curse seems to have entered our life, when it seems to us that if we had been given over into the hands of a cunning and cruel tormentor things could not have been more nicely contrived to pain us at every point. Our nature seems to have been studied with a view to discover our most tender and vulnerable spots, and our circumstances to have been arranged so as to expose these spots to the utmost pain. It is a triumph indeed when a man in such a condition can put aside the impatience and unreason and resentment which naturally rise within him. It is the triumph of faith when he can look in the eye that guides the knife to his heart by slow degrees, and can say, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." Some men are called upon to look forward to years of steadily increasing pain and anxiety, and to measure in their own experience how sad and weary and apparently cruel a thing life can become; and if in that prospect they put aside unbelief and find evidence of God's love in unlikely quarters, they pay a tribute to God of more value than a hecatomb, a sacrifice of which God will show His appreciation.

When challenged to prove His love for His people, God replies in a manner unexpected and startling: "Was not Esau Jacob's brother? Yet I loved Jacob, but Esau I hated." And then the prophet goes on to exhibit the different results of love and hatred. The desolation of Israel is but for a time; that of Edom is lasting. And this difference is to be referred to the fact that God loved the one and hated the other. The essence of this reply is contained in the affirmation of the freeness, permanence, and substantial result of God's love. There was no reason but God's own love for Jacob's prosperity. Jacob was not a very attractive person. Certainly he did nothing that could merit that his children should for many centuries enjoy the exceptional countenance of God. But love never goes by merit. And deep love, a love that aims at great things for its object, demands faith. Present interests must often be postponed to future interests; and in order that love may effectually care for future interests, it must be trusted.

This passage has assumed a permanent significance from the circumstance that the subtle mind of Paul laid hold of it as his proof text for the doctrine of election. God loves one and hates another; chooses men to this and that destiny, irrespective of their antecedent conduct. "The children," says Paul, "being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him who calleth." It would be difficult to contrive a form of words more definitely conveying the idea that God's election of one man and rejection of another are due to His own purpose, and not to the character of the men. Paul quite appreciated the difficulty of holding this position, and anticipated the indignant exclamations which in all ages have risen to men's lips when this doctrine of election is affirmed. He himself states the objection. "If the con-



duct and destiny of men depend on God's will, why doth He yet find fault; for who hath resisted His will?" And he does not untie this knot. He recognises the difficulty and leaves it unsolved. But the very fact that he sees and states the indignant remonstrances of those to whom the doctrine is announced, proves that the doctrine he held was the distasteful and repellent doctrine that the character and destiny of men are determined by the will of God.

That this was the teaching of Paul, I myself have no doubt whatever. Augustinians and Calvinists may in some particulars have drawn conclusions from his teaching which he might disown, but in the main they have interpreted him truly. And modern critics who study his writings merely as historical documents and without any religious bias, find in these writings what is usually known as the Calvinistic doctrine of election. And indeed, it was impossible, or most unlikely, that Paul should on a point of this kind separate himself from the belief in which he was trained, and which is held by the great majority of Semitic and indeed of Oriental peoples. Had he lived now and been trained in a different school of thought, he might have laid greater emphasis on the self-determining power of man and the freedom of the human will.

But if any one is disposed summarily to throw over Paul's doctrine of election, and expose it to the abhorrence and ridicule of men on account of the frightful inferences which may be drawn from it, it should in fairness be remembered that Paul disclaimed, though he could not disprove these inferences. He saw that these inferences were dishonouring to God, and he could not deny that they seemed to be legitimately drawn from his teaching; but he could not on that account surrender the doctrine of God's determination of all things. And if we repudiate with all our strength the unworthy conceptions of God which seem

to flow from Paul's teaching, we must beware of rejecting with them the ideas of God's all-pervading power and love, and so, according to the German proverb, throw away the baby with the water of the bath. The essential thought which Paul wishes to enforce, is one which no serious mind will lightly repudiate, that God's will lies deeper in the matter of salvation than our own, that it is the love of God and no merit of ours which initiates our restoration to holiness and to God. And if in pressing this truth Paul makes statements or uses arguments which you think do less than justice to God's love, you must measure all by the revelation of Himself God has given you in Christ. We know but one God, and that is He who is known through and in Christ. Every view of God which does not harmonize with that, you must reject wherever you find it.

In this prophet of an expiring dispensation signs of the end are apparent. There was a growing insensibility to sin. This was very distinctly present to the mind of Malachi. At each new charge he brings against them, he represents them as exclaiming in astonishment and conscious innocence, "Ye have despised My Name. Yet Ye say, Wherein have we despised Thy Name! Ye offer polluted bread, and ye say, Wherein have we polluted Thee? Ye have wearied the Lord with your words, yet ye say, Wherein have we wearied Him?" and so on throughout. The people of Malachi's time had so lost moral sense that they could not any longer distinguish between profanity and reverence, honourable and dishonourable conduct. By their worship with which they expected to propitiate God, they insulted Him. Malachi felt it was almost hopeless work, trying to beget in such persons an apprehension of God's holiness and a love of it. They had not the requisite organ. The colour-blindness which mistakes red for green is a fatal defect in an engine-driver; this loss of moral sense

is equally fatal in those who, likewise, are running fast on through all manner of spiritual dangers.

In Malachi's time this fatal insensibility to moral distinctions had grown up in close connexion with a growing spirit of intellectual inquiry. This book reflects the questioning spirit which was abroad when it was written. In captivity the Jews, as they mingled with men of other religions and habits, had seen and learned much, which suggested to them many new trains of thought, and prompted them to look with more critical eyes on their own relation to God and to all things. It might be supposed that this newly awakened intellectual activity and spirit of inquiry could do nothing but good. But there are many things which eventually and to the mass do good, which at first and in individual cases do incalculable harm. Pestilence does good, but only by first spreading death and dismay. War frequently does good, but only through blood and hardship and sorrow. And good comes of intellectual inquiry, but neither is its path to victory a bloodless one. Scepticism, the disposition to take nothing on trust, the resolution to have clear proof and verification of everything, is but one side of a keen hunger for truth, the only food of the inner man. Wherever the supreme importance of truth is felt there is a determination to rest on nothing but what is immovable, to dig down to the living rock. But the sceptical spirit, though easy to cultivate, is difficult to satisfy. Questions may always be asked which it is impossible to answer. And hence the need of concentrating faith on the one or two fundamental truths which cannot be shaken, and which suffice for our present needs. Finding our feet firm even on one point, we can wait with equanimity till the day dawns and a wider view is opened.

It was indeed a radical question which the Jews of Malachi's day were putting. "What profit is there in

“serving God?” they were asking. “There is no difference made between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not. Where is the God of judgment: the God who makes a difference, and makes a difference in accordance with character?” This tone of thought finds its most elaborate utterance in the book of Ecclesiastes, and it is directly and vigorously met by Malachi. Every day he was meeting doleful and sullen spirits who bluntly declared it was vain to serve God. “We have walked mournfully before Him, and kept His ordinance, and what profit is it? The proud, who do not humble themselves before God at all, are the prosperous men. They that work wickedness and take their own way of making gain, are set up. Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of God, and He delighteth in them. Where is the God of judgment?”—all which goes as near blasphemy and atheism as this muttering sullenness dares to go.

But of course such questions had to be asked, and have still to be asked. How does moral character affect our relation to things external? Is the good man exempt from suffering; and if not, why not? There is apparently an instinct in man which claims happiness as the accompaniment or result of well-doing. It is felt that though prosperity is not the object the good man has in view, yet prosperity must ultimately accrue to the righteous. The human heart claims to profit by integrity; claims, in other words, to be in a world in which all things are subordinated to moral ends and moral uses. The repugnance we feel in presence of successful iniquity, the instinctive rebellion against suffering evil when we are not doing evil, are just so many acknowledgments that we are under a moral government in which we naturally expect that things external will be ruled in accordance with our inner state.

But as soon as we look closely at the matter we learn to distinguish. We distinguish between a world adapted for

training moral beings, and a world in which they can most appropriately live when trained. This world, with its physical laws which make no distinction between the good man and the bad, is admirably fitted for a place of training, badly fitted for a permanent abode. Connected with this physical world by our own body, subjected to its laws, exposed to its accidents, open at every pore to its presence, its influences, and its temptations, we are in the very best condition for being trained and tested as moral beings. Were we in a world in which immediate and visible punishment followed every transgression, and in which the good man escaped shipwreck and earthquake, illness, loss, and death, we should be under a system of bribery and corruption under which it would be impossible to know who loved virtue for its own sake and who pursued it as the most profitable course. If things outside of us, the world and all its laws, at once and in every case accommodated themselves to the character of men's actions, if bodily disease never attacked the spiritually healthy, and worldly prosperity never fell to the lot of the ungodly, then virtue and pleasure would be so confounded that we should never know whether it was the one or the other of things so essentially different that we were choosing; and the love of pleasure would so draw us towards righteous action that no love of virtue for its own sake could ever possibly be educated in us. It would dwindle into nonentity like the unused muscle.

Let us then be content to submit to our own individual share of the disappointments, perplexities, and sorrows which form so essential a part of this school in which we now are. When we suffer and keenly feel what a pain life has become to us, let us remember that such suffering is the only known or conceivable means of sifting the desire for pleasure from the love of righteousness in our hearts, the only means of giving our character that final form



it receives when we accept righteousness bare and for righteousness' sake. It is thus our love for one another is deepened and acquires a strength subject to no decay. Sacrifice is the food of love; and the suffering involved in sacrifice shakes the soil about love's roots and lets them strike deeper. Our love for our friend receives a new quality and becomes a new thing when we learn to love in spite of appearances and consequences and for our friend's own sake. And only so can there ever be produced in us that genuine, inherent love of righteousness which is the one essential of eternal happiness and worth. It is this we must somehow attain to; and in proportion as a man recognises the importance of attaining it will he submit to the actual training through which God is bringing him to it.

But though in this world a man's circumstances and worldly status give little clue to his character, the belief remains that the time will come when things outward and things inward will be more in harmony, and when happiness and holiness, after their long courtship here below, will be permanently married. This consummation Malachi announces in the words, "The Lord will suddenly come to His temple." This holy men always felt; that the Judge was at the door. In our present condition we are by our body made subject to physical laws; and through the temptations thus occasioned we have to fight our way to true spiritual superiority to physical allurements and physical threatenings. And when this is accomplished the body perishes and we rightfully inherit a spiritual body in which this superiority to things physical can be maintained with less of shame and failure, less also of anxiety and strain. And for aught we know the world itself may be going forward to a condition in which a finer and easier life may be possible. Amid all the groanings and travailings of creation, a new heavens and a new earth, a new adjustment of elemental

forces, new climatal conditions, new relations of physical laws, may be being prepared, so that in ages far distant there may be found a home suitable for those who have by determined spiritual preference attained to a spiritual body.

## II.

Malachi was face to face with a generation characterized by scepticism and insensibility to moral distinctions. They had no loyalty to God, nor any inward impulse towards holiness, but kept a profit and loss account with God, and saw no reason why they should serve God if they made nothing by it. They must have been as pleasing an object of contemplation to Satan as Job was displeasing. But with the strange infatuation that possesses mankind in dealing with God, they continued to offer sacrifices, but such only as could insult God. Men are often blamed for thinking of God as a magnified man. But really no great harm comes of this, if they magnify Him sufficiently; the harm begins when men deal with God as they would not deal with any good and sensible man, offering Him a formal worship which any sensible man would recognise as hollow, and repudiate accordingly, or a grotesque and mumming worship, which a sensible man, with his eye upon realities, would pity and wonder at, if he did not scorn.

To his duller-souled contemporaries Malachi has sound advice to give. First, he says, "Return unto Me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of hosts." So long as a man keeps a profit and loss account with God, he is sure to be a sceptic, and in all probability will be profane as well. No man can understand God who criticises His doings with a hostile eye. For much that happens in providence is liable to be misread, and it will be misread where the reader is in an attitude antagonistic to God. The first step towards reconciliation with God and readjust-

ment of our religious belief is to credit the Supreme with wisdom and love. Put aside resentment at the miseries that have fallen to your share in life, and take a wider survey of things, and admit that on the whole, intelligence and holiness and love are the ruling powers in the world. Gradually out of chaos, physical and moral, life, light, and love are arising, are they not?

But all return to God must be practical, not intellectual only, not sentimental only. "Ye say, Wherein shall a man return?" Why need ye ask? "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed Me." Return then by bringing your tithes into the storehouse. No repentance is to be trusted which does not utter itself in practical shapes. A religion which is not inward is no religion at all, but a religion which is exclusively inward is also a delusion. Return to God is of course a spiritual act, but if it is nothing more, it is not even that. The faith which saves is a spiritual act, but if it assumes no practical forms, it does not save. "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved,"—yes, if belief takes the practical form of using the help of Christ to save you from your sin. But not by some clever, dexterous manipulation of the inner man is any one saved.

Secondly, Malachi assures the people that when they speak to one another for the purpose of encouragement in patience and holiness, the Lord hearkens and writes in His book of remembrance that such and such persons fear His name. God knows, Malachi would say, that it is not easy to maintain faith in a time like ours. He knows it calls for no common fortitude, no ordinary faith, to hear with patience the worst tidings and to say, "It is the Lord, let Him do what seemeth Him good." He knows how hard it is for the innocent to be as the guilty without resentment. If we are, like Christ Himself, driven sometimes to cry out, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" He cannot

be surprised and will not condemn. Nay, nothing moves God so much as to see this man and that man suffering in darkness, and yet retaining undiminished faith in God's goodness and love. How is a whole nation touched when it sees a few brave men hold a post against overwhelming odds! How eager are the people whose name they have kept from stain to reward them for their constancy! How certain are their names to be set down for everlasting remembrance in their country's annals! And God does not forget those who suffer for His name's sake. Happy are they who have passed through times of anxiety, loss, sorrow, temptation, and have maintained their faith. "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love Him."

Thirdly, Malachi closes his book and sums up all his advice in the words, "Remember ye the law of Moses My servant." This was the only way out of the despondent and doubting frame of mind into which the people had fallen. Similarly the book of Ecclesiastes, which reads like a sceptic's hand-book, or cynic's *vade mecum*, closes with the remarkable words, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man." There are, at all events, many persons who must be content with that. The problems of human life they cannot solve. Significance in human life they see none. Results from human toil are in their judgment vanity and vexation; life is a compulsory, weary, hopeless treadmill, that merely reckons time and grinds itself away, accomplishing no single good result of all the labour that keeps it going. Such persons are happy, or at least their misery is dulled, if they can fall back on duty, and possess their souls in some assurance that duty remains, and that it is not their part to question but to obey. To many natures an abiding satisfaction, if no very

ecstatic joy, accompanies the blind performance of their part in life. They have no light on the meaning of things, but they have a conscience, and in obeying it they feel sure they are doing right.

Better advice could not be given to sceptics of any age than to remind them of the permanent satisfaction and abiding reality of duty. The state of mind in which Malachi found his contemporaries is frequently produced in our own day. Conscious failure in life naturally tends to embitter a man. If he has any pride, it is galling in the extreme to find that all he has spent himself on has turned to dust and ashes in his hand. Many, in such circumstances, brand life as a cruel deception. Nothing, they tell you, can be made of it, there is no aim worth living for; all that professes to be so is either a lie or a mistake. It takes a pure and strong nature to stand the test of failure. Where there is not genuine humility, the results of failure are apt to be disastrous. Men are tested when summoned in providence to accept blame, to confess mistake, to admit weakness. The secret of much of the cynicism, aimlessness, bad temper, and unhappiness of men is that the objects they have all their life aimed at turn out to be worthless or unattainable. But not to believe in life is not to believe in God. To gird at the present order of things, and sneer at success and earnestness, is to sneer at God. To lose hold of the faith that there is a purpose in life, and that it is worth living, is to lose hold of faith in God.

But a man may doubt many things, he may doubt everything, yet if he retains faith in duty and in a Divine order, this grain of mustard seed will grow to a faith that gives shelter and a resting-place to all vagrant thoughts. Each man must begin with what is clear to himself. And he who honestly does what he feels sure is right will, by living up to his moral convictions, arrive at all the faith he



needs. It is not intellectual conviction, but moral conviction, that gives men entrance to God's presence. "Without holiness" no man shall see God; without any knowledge to speak of, many a man may. And if you find a man following the light that is in him, turning to it and cherishing it and using it; if he has truth and integrity in his own soul, and esteems duty above all, then you cannot fix a limit to that man's advance. For all truth and duty are one, and the narrow and obscure path he is on leads infallibly to God. If a man denies himself and sets duty as his guiding light, it will lead him on till it is absorbed in eternal day.

Above all, Malachi sought to impart to his contemporaries the assurance that the day of the Lord's appearing was at hand. To those who question God's government, because it is not apparent, he announces that a day is coming when that difficulty shall no longer be felt. Although, he says, you cannot now get any clue to a man's character by surveying his outward circumstances,—though no difference is immediately and uniformly made between the righteous and the wicked,—it is certain that such a difference will be made in the future. The great burden of the prophets was: "The day of the Lord is coming." "Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with him: for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him: for the reward of his hands shall be given him." "The Lord whom ye seek, whose absence you scoffingly remark upon, or murmuringly complain of, and whose presence and judgment you invite, He shall suddenly come to His Temple," like the priest whose duty it was to superintend the Temple arrangements, and who might at any moment knock and demand admittance; who came suddenly and unexpectedly, no one knew when, and of whom the Rabbis used to say, "Sometimes he came at the cock-crowing, sometimes

a little earlier, sometimes a little later. He came and knocked, and they opened to him. Then said he unto them, All ye who have washed (all ye who are ready) come and cast lots," that is, for the privilege of ministering to the Lord in the daily service.<sup>1</sup> Thus shall the Lord come suddenly to His Temple, and judgment shall begin at the house of God. The coming of the Lord is no such time of universal prosperity as you imagine. You are deceived if you fancy that the presence of the Lord will necessarily be welcome to you. On the contrary, He shall sit as a refiner, carefully sifting the pure metal from the dross, destroying as much as He saves, blasting as many hopes and expectations as He satisfies.

This received a remarkable fulfilment in the Lord's first coming. The cleansing of the Temple in Jerusalem was the first sign He gave of the thorough work He meant to make with the people to whom He was sent. John had warned them that He would come with His fan in His hand, and that it would be a bad day for all chaff and light corn. He had warned them that His baptism would no longer be a mere drop or two of water, that would roll over them and let them retain much impurity, but that He would baptize them with fire that would find its fuel in their sin, and would live and burn till all was consumed. This our Lord began to fulfil in His cleansing of the Temple. It was a hard, distasteful task, more arduous than any prophet had undertaken. The Baptist preached to those who *came to him*, but our Lord penetrated single-handed into the stronghold of inviolable traditions, and made the very masters of Israel, the priests and teachers, bow before the blazing light of true zeal for God and obedience to His word. To meet the gaze of an exasperated crowd, to make enemies of a whole class and interest in the community, by expelling those who made gain of God's

<sup>1</sup> See Edersheim's *Temple Service*.

service, is what no one would have done who was making a mere pretence of doing a work of reform. Thus always Christ makes thorough work, does not blink the requirements of any case, does not cleanse so that the thing needs again to go back to the fuller's lye. We shrug our shoulders and pass by where matters are difficult to mend; we think it good if a little improvement has been made, or if even there is some promise of amendment; but not so Christ. He carries matters through, and makes thorough work. Nothing that defileth shall enter His kingdom; not the seeming good, but the really good; not those who please men, but those who satisfy God; not those who say Lord, Lord, but those who do His bidding; not those who see the propriety of being unworldly, but those who are so; not those who wish godliness were compatible with self-seeking, but those who know what it is to *love God*, and are content to serve Him.

The question then with these people should have been, not, Will God never come? but, Are we prepared for His coming? What would happen to us, were He to come? So with all who say, Let God show Himself. If He will have us serve Him with fidelity and self-devotion, if He will have us be persuaded that He is, and that He loves righteousness and will reward it, let Him show this love of righteousness. But are you prepared for this manifestation? Suppose God were to come with manifest judgment, running a clear and sharp line between good and evil, are you quite sure that this would be to your immediate advantage? Suppose He were to appear as a refiner of silver, are you sure that you would be found true metal, and not merely silver-washed?

The other figure used by Malachi seems to be intended to convey the same meaning and the same warning. "The Sun of righteousness shall arise," but though inspiring and health-giving to some, it will be scorching and con-

suming to others. "The day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all that do wickedly shall be as stubble: . . . but unto you that fear My name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings." The manifestation of God's righteousness, while it will be life to some, will be death to others. The same sun will carry life and death in its rays,—life to all that has its roots deep sunk in the moist soil of simple godliness, death to all that is only superficially rooted and has but a shallow hold of religion.

This Sun arose in our Lord's first coming. The light He brought gladdened and revived many, but to others it brought exasperation and doom. The presence of pure truth cheered all who had waited for God, but withered the expectations and plans of many, and caused them to feel they had chosen outer darkness as their portion. This Sun of righteousness has for a while set, and we are living in the short arctic night through which the afterglow of sunset shines till the swift dawn arrives and absorbs it in the fuller blaze of the newly risen sun; or we live in a kind of moonlight, in a light reflected from the sun that has set, but which thus proves its existence, and helps us to believe it will rise again.

It is those who have known darkness who can best appreciate the promise of light. So characteristic of our present state is doubt, that it is difficult to imagine with distinctness a state in which all questioning will be past, and in which we shall proceed upon truths we here grope after, and have unquestioning assurance of the existences which here evade the grasp of our faith. The whole spiritual experience of many men is made up of attempts to pass on to a securer faith; of attempts to read the lessons of nature, of revelation, and of providence; to decipher the worn and broken fragments of other men's experience, and so to win to a faith so assured as to become the actual foundation of their life. When we reach this faith, and no longer have the

slightest dubiety about God's existence and love for us, when we reach the same kind of unhesitating and irresistible and spontaneous belief in God as we have in those who live in the same house with us, we feel as if we had now attained, and as if life could do no more for us. But really we then only begin. Only when our faith in God is of this kind can we go forward with full strength and single aim to the life God means us to live. Only when we as little question God's existence and love as we question the existence and utility of the sunshine; only when we live in God in the same way as we live in the light, counting on it, accepting it as the great fact,—are we filled with the energy and freedom and joy that fit us for true life.

Therefore this light is described as "healing." All the weakness that comes of doubt is necessarily healed in presence of all-penetrating, all-pervading righteous judgment and government. To have all doubt of God's love for us removed, to know as we are known, this will make all things new to us. If we were quite sure that God is our portion, and that not for one moment can He cease to desire and work for our good, we should delight in this and find it enough, and cease to hanker after material advantages and comforts. We should, that is to say, be "healed" of that weakness which directly springs from want of assurance. How many good men lessen their influence and diminish their happiness by this weakness in calamity! How much is every Christian profession spotted by what spectators recognise as mere worldliness! But if Christians believed in the constant, uniform, and sleepless love of God, this could not be so. Those ordinary men who are exposed to the ordinary reverses of life have that in them which can make light of worldly loss and rejoice in tribulation, if only they are assured that God is their portion.

The effects of this full light are described in the words: "Ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall. And



ye shall tread down the wicked ; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet." These words have been excellently paraphrased by the late Dean Stanley. The day, he says, "was to be like the glorious but terrible uprising of the Eastern sun, which should wither to the very roots the insolence and the injustice of mankind ; but as its rays extended, like the wings of the Egyptian sun-god, should by its healing and invigorating influences call forth the good from their obscurity, prancing and bounding like the young cattle in the burst of spring, and treading down under their feet the dust and ashes to which the same bright sun had burnt up the tangled thicket of iniquitous dealing." The sunshine of righteousness flooding the world and conquering the darkness shall be so congenial to God's people, that they shall leap as stall-fed calves. Existence at last shall be a joy to them. They shall feel as if a great weight had been lifted off them. They shall feel that exuberance of life which causes children and animals to skip and bound in the overflow of spirits, and superfluity of energy, and absolute freedom from care. Very different is the present condition of many of God's people. Many are so burdened that not one day in the year do they recover any of this youthful exuberance of joy and of life. They have perhaps never been successful in life ; have never attained to circumstances so easy that they need not overwork themselves nor be over-anxious ; they are hard-driven at all times, go exhausted to bed at night and rise weary and languid in the morning, they have never energy enough, go as it were panting through life and sink exhausted at last. Others, again, are haunted by a more inward gloom. They can never find the satisfaction and strength and joy in their religion they know they ought to find ; they either prevent themselves from doing so by a want of singleness of eye, by looking really to the world for comfort, or they fret themselves with scruples, entangle themselves in

perplexities, are content to remain in doubt, and live depressed and weakened. How seldom do you see a Christian exulting like a strong man rejoicing to run a race, taking all duty and hardship easily and lightly, as one who has abundant strength to spare! Like are most Christians to the weary, hard-driven beasts, that drag their age-and-toil-stiffened limbs out of the stall with a groan, as they are led to their daily task. But instead of this reluctance and conscious weakness, and pain and despondency, there will be in God's presence, and there ought to be now in all who are God's people, a full consciousness of His love and of the glory of serving Him, and of the fairness of His government, which make men exult in present strength, and feel glad that life is eternal.

MARCUS DODS.

---

PAUL AND TITUS AT JERUSALEM.

GALATIANS ii. 1-5.

BAUR says in his *Paulus*,<sup>1</sup> "The *παρεισάκτοι ψευδαδέλφοι* (of Gal. ii. 4) are those *τινὲς κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τ. Ἰουδαίας*, of whom Acts xv. speaks. They were thus called because they came to Antioch as members of the Church of Jerusalem, in order to investigate on the spot the report which had reached Jerusalem, that in Antioch the Mosaic law was completely shaken off; and then that they might immediately bring to bear their own stringent Jewish principles."

Now as a description of the *character* of the men in question this statement is most inadequate. The supposition that Paul's Judaizing opponents were genuine representatives of Jewish Christian orthodoxy, on which the Tübingen reconstruction of the New Testament so largely

<sup>1</sup> English translation, pp. 127, 128, *note*.

depends, has no real support in the Galatian epistle. Not "because they came to Antioch as members of the Church at Jerusalem," does Paul brand them as "false brethren," but as being, whether at Antioch or Jerusalem, mere nominal Christians, professed believers in Jesus, yet unchanged Pharisees at heart, unscrupulous, self-seeking men, who made of Christ and His cross a means subordinate to Jewish party ends.<sup>1</sup>

Of the *sphere of their operations* however we are persuaded that Baur has given the true account. His explanation applies well to the accompanying terms, "privily brought in . . . who (such as) came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." Where was this "liberty" exercised or to be seen but in the Churches of the heathen mission? To the Galatians the words of *v. 4b* could only signify the liberty possessed by themselves in common with other Gentile Christians, in which Paul has identified himself with them. For this in truth the whole epistle is a vehement contention.<sup>2</sup> The Apostle is not speaking of the manner in which, or the purpose for which, these "deceitful workers" had originally entered the Church at Jerusalem (how did this concern himself or his readers?), but of their stealthy intrusion into the free Pauline Churches. They had crept into the Gentile Christian fold, invited no doubt by Jewish sympathisers, to take hostile observation of the liberty practised there, on purpose to destroy it. Unquestionably these intriguers had at their back a party in Jerusalem. Probably they followed the Gentile missionaries thither when the latter "went up about this question"; so that Paul and Barnabas were confronted by the same faction, and in part by the same opponents, in the Jewish as already in the Syrian capital.

<sup>1</sup> Chap. vi. 11-13. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 17; iv. 2; xi. 13-15, 20, 26; Phil. iii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Chap. i. 7, 8; ii. 12; iv. 9, 12—*v. 3 (the free Jerusalem above is our mother)*; vi. 12.

But in *v. 4*, as we read his words, St. Paul is not thinking of his old adversaries as he met them at Jerusalem, but of their previous action in his own field of labour, which had occasioned this journey and conference with the Jewish Christian chiefs.

This view accords precisely with the situation given in Acts xv. The later interference of the "certain from James" (*v. 12*) bore a similar character. Moreover, the words of *v. 4*, thus understood, are equally pertinent to the proceedings of the Judaising emissaries infesting heathen Christianity at the time of the Apostle's writing. In the light of their own present experience, and after the denunciation of chap. i. 7, 8, the Galatians could be at no loss to identify the class of men St. Paul here intends, nor to understand the ground of his indictment. "The troublers" now trying to fasten the Jewish yoke on the neck of Gentile Christendom were men of just the same colour and stamp, and pursued the same crooked policy, as the Judaisers of seven years ago. "These false brethren, smuggled in amongst us, to filch away our liberty in Christ—I have met them before," he says; "I never yielded to them one inch; I carried the struggle to Jerusalem, and there, once for all, in the person of Titus, I vindicated your imperilled Christian rights."

On this interpretation, *v. 4* stands connected, not with the foregoing verse, taken by itself,<sup>1</sup> but with the entire context of *vv. 1-3*. The full stop should follow, not precede, *v. 3*. Vers. 4, 5 then relate the occasion which brought about the memorable visit to Jerusalem just described: "And because of the false brethren . . . *I took the course I did (or, these things came to pass)*"—in some

<sup>1</sup> "Because of the false brethren Titus was not compelled to be circumcised," is an inconsequence defying explanation. It was they, and they alone, who insisted upon this. As well say, "Because of the enemy the city was not compelled to surrender."

such fashion, we imagine, Paul intended to conclude; but as he dilates on the conduct of these former adversaries, the precursors of such an army of "troublers," his eye kindles, his heart takes fire, and with a rush of indignant emotion he breaks off the half-finished sentence—"to whom," he cries, "not even for an hour did we yield by subjection, that the truth of the gospel might abide with you!" Through the shipwreck of the grammar, the meaning of the sentence comes off safe enough. "Not yielding for an hour" supplies the ellipsis negatively, and with heightened animation and effect. Vividly does this phrase portray the course Paul adopted and the spirit of his action at this juncture, from the hour that he and Titus set out for Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas (*vv.* 1), until the hour when, with Titus standing by his side, he had won from the mother Church the endorsement of his "gospel of the uncircumcision," and the full recognition of his Gentile ministry (*vv.* 2, 3).

*Titus* forms the centre of interest in *vv.* 1-3. Paul had indeed taken up to Jerusalem with him the very subject-matter in dispute.<sup>1</sup> In the person of Titus, his "true child according to the common faith," and doubtless a noble specimen of Gentile Christianity, his "gospel of the uncircumcision" stood incarnate before the Jewish Church. The Apostle's challenge,<sup>2</sup> "Am I running, or have I run, in vain?" was now no mere question of words or topic for doctrinal discussion; it must be answered at once, and in the most practical and unmistakable form. By bringing

<sup>1</sup> The *συν* in *συνπαραλαβῶν* refers to *Paul* himself: compare *ὁ σὺν ἐμοί* (*v.* 3). There were "certain others" in the deputation (Acts xv. 2); but these were probably Jews, or if Gentiles, persons of less distinction than Titus, so that his case became practically the *test case*.

<sup>2</sup> With Meyer, Hofmann, Wieseler, we read *μή πως, κ.τ.λ.*, *interrogatively*: "I put before them the gospel which I preach amongst the Gentiles, (putting it to them, asking them) whether haply I am running or had run in vain." St. Paul did not go up to Jerusalem to resolve a doubt in his own mind, but to compel the Church there to express its mind.



Titus to Jerusalem, Paul had staked the controversy on his single person, and brought it to a crisis. The Judaistic party, here in its native seat, where everything was in its favour, bent its whole strength, we may be sure, to compel the circumcision of Titus—and it failed! Had there been any yielding on this point, the Gentile mission would have been stultified; Paul would have seemed in that case truly to have “run in vain,” to have preached a defective gospel that could not stand the test. Had the authorities in Jerusalem on their part sustained the demand of Paul’s opponents and insisted on Titus’ circumcision, refused by the envoys from Antioch, then there must have been an open rupture, which nobody alleged to have taken place. The fact that, in spite of the utmost compulsion, Titus remained by his side, in the presence of the renowned heads of the Church at Jerusalem, uncircumcised, was itself an answer—a triumphant answer to St. Paul’s appeal. His purpose in taking this Greek disciple to the Jewish metropolis was fully realized. The step was however one so critical, involving so many risks, that, as the Apostle’s careful wording in *v.* 1 seems to suggest, it was taken on his own distinct responsibility, unshared by Barnabas; and he was guided in it, as in other supreme moments of his life, “by a revelation,”<sup>1</sup> his course was prompted immediately from heaven.

The mention of Titus in this connexion was calculated to awaken a keen interest in the minds of Galatian readers. From the Corinthian letters we know that this eminent disciple and friend of the Apostle was in attendance upon him during the latter period of the third missionary tour; probably therefore in its former part, when he made his

<sup>1</sup> Κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, Paul says, reminding us of the words of chap. i. 11, 12, οὐ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον . . . ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως. The same Power which had imparted Paul’s gospel intervened to preserve it at this perilous crisis. Compare Acts xxi. 27–36. for one of the many dangers this proceeding involved.

second visit to Galatia (Acts xviii. 23). At any rate, Titus' name is introduced as that of one known to the readers, and known therefore to be a Gentile brother, like themselves. Its introduction at this point raised at once the burning question of the hour. Titus going up to Jerusalem with Paul—to the mother-city of believers, as “the troublers” said (chap. iv. 25, 26), where the faith of Christ is held in its pristine purity, where every Christian is circumcised and keeps the law—how could he be admitted or tolerated there? Ver. 3 meets this tacit inquiry: it gives the answer to Paul's challenge to the Jerusalem Church in the form most telling for the Galatians themselves. The question *now* pending was, Shall the Galatians be circumcised? (chap. v. 1-3.) *Then* it was, Shall Titus be circumcised, or not? Paul's readers were surely quick enough of wit to perceive that their case was one with that of Titus, as in a moment they would see their own “troublers” mirrored in the “false brethren” of v. 4. “After preaching in Gentile regions for fourteen years,” Paul seems to say, “I went up to Jerusalem, and moreover took along with me *Titus*. He is my son in Christ, as you know, and an embodiment of your own Gentile faith. I did this under God's immediate direction. I thus laid before the Church there, especially before its chiefs, whose authority is so often quoted against me, the gospel which I preach amongst the Gentiles, and asked them what they thought of it? What, you wish to know, was the result? Well, *Titus remained uncircumcised*, despite compulsion, in the very citadel of Judaism. His status as a free Gentile Christian was maintained, with the consent of the leaders of the Jewish Church. So the battle of your liberty was fought and won.” Such a paraphrase, as we think, puts nothing more into the Apostle's words than they imported to the original readers. The link we have attempted to supply, connecting v. 2 with vv. 1 and 3 on either hand, lies in the

fact that Titus was Paul's "gospel of the uncircumcision" *in concreto*.

Vers. 1-3 are therefore complete in themselves. The assertion of Gentile Christian freedom from the Mosaic law in the crucial instance<sup>1</sup> of Titus was the event of this second recorded visit of Paul to Jerusalem after his conversion. When he has said, "But not even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised," the Apostle must have paused for a moment, and his readers may well have paused and drawn a long breath of relief or of astonishment at this momentous announcement. Vers. 4, 5 go on to add—what was very necessary in itself, and suitable to put the Galatians on their guard—that it was the action of dishonest Jewish interlopers that made this previous vindication needful. Through the whole passage there runs an undercurrent of tacit reference to the events transpiring in Galatia, where the conflict now going on raised anew the great question already settled years ago in agreement with the Church at Jerusalem. Vers. 6-10 conclude the account of the matter, by showing on what footing Paul and Barnabas now stood with the "pillars" at Jerusalem. This sentence, though much longer than the foregoing, is logically and grammatically parallel to it. Each begins with *δέ* and a prepositional phrase; each, singularly enough, breaks down in an *anacoluthon*. Vers. 4, 5 define Paul's relation at this crisis to the Judaisers, now making their first appearance in the province of the Gentile mission; *vv.* 6-10, his relation to the leaders of the Jewish Church, from whom he claimed recognition and support. The Judaistic propaganda, and the Jewish apostolic Church—these were the two parties between

<sup>1</sup> "But *not even* Titus who was with me"—in the Holy City, in the presence of the *δοκοῦντες*. This is a more natural explanation of the *οὐδέ* than to suppose, with Meyer, that the fact of Titus being a *teacher* made his uncircumcision specially offensive to conservative Jewish Christians. For *ἀλλ' οὐδέ* after a question, comp. Acts xix. 2; Æschylus, *Persæ* 792; also 1 Cor. iii. 2, iv. 3.

whom Paul and Titus placed themselves, as we find them in *vv.* 1-3 of this chapter. From the former they appealed to the latter, and happily not in vain.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

---

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD  
TESTAMENT.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.—I.

Two distinguished literary laymen have made the Book of Isaiah their own. Mr. Matthew Arnold in 1883 published some remarkable papers on "Isaiah of Jerusalem" in *The Nineteenth Century*; he had already made a benevolent attempt to revise and annotate the A.V. of the "great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration" (Isa. xl.-lxvi.) for Government elementary schools, to which he prefixed a stimulative and finely written introduction. Sir Edward Strachey, the friend of Maurice and popularizer of *Morte Darthur*, went much more thoroughly into the subject, I am afraid to say how many years ago, in his *Jewish History and Politics*, to which in the second edition (1874) he appended a revision of the A.V. of the Book of Isaiah. Reading over again the words in which these authors have expressed themselves towards the A.V., one realizes the better the enormous difficulties of the task which the Revisers of Isaiah had before them. Both are lovers of their native tongue and of the glories of its literature; both regard the A.V. of Isaiah primarily as a masterpiece of English, and would have only those alterations made in it which could not be evaded by the utmost ingenuity of an advocate. It would have been no use to reply to these writers (not known as Hebraists) that the Authorized Version is an admirable *testo di lingua*, but no longer adequate as a translation. The retort would

have been that Hebraists had no ear, and were not competent to express true meanings of the Hebrew in noble English. The remark has at any rate often been made with no affected timidity; the profession whether of the higher<sup>1</sup> or of the lower criticism is often represented as incompatible with a literary sense. "Yea, who knoweth not such things as these?"

It would be interesting to ask these two jealous guardians of our language whether they would not soften their tone, now that the revision of the A.V. of Isaiah is before them. Nowhere—if I may trust my own judgment—has a more persistent effort been made to preserve the rhythmic effect of the original (*i.e.* of the A.V.) even when altering the words. For my own part, I am at once pleased with the result—and displeased. Let me explain. The problem of revision has long been before the world of scholars. My own solution would have been at once a simpler and a bolder one than that adopted by the Revisers, *viz.* to provide (1) a faithful translation of the O.T. (and especially of the Psalms and Isaiah), with a few brief paraphrastic notes for the home use of educated readers; and (2) a much slighter revision of the A.V. for churches and for the home-use of simple readers, in which only the most notorious errors were corrected, and that as tenderly as possible from the point of view of English rhythm. This plan of course was never even considered, because it never occurred to Convocation, by which body the two Revision Companies were called into existence. Still, under the circumstances of the case, pleasure may well predominate over the opposite feeling. Even though one may question the literary principles on which the fabric of our Bible has been "restored," and be disposed to apply the saying in Matthew ix. 16, one may cheerfully admit that the result in

<sup>1</sup> Higher, only in so far as it is based upon simpler and in a certain sense more primary criticism; not with any arrogant or contemptuous implication.



many parts jars less upon the ear than might have been expected.

Let us now proceed to compare Mr. Arnold's version of Isa. vii. 16 with that given by the Revisers. The former runs thus,—

For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land shall be forsaken, whose two kings make thee afraid.

The latter agrees with this as far as "choose the good," and continues,—

. . . the land whose two kings thou abhorrest shall be forsaken.

The rendering of R.V. has been anticipated, so far as the rhythm and the order of the clauses are concerned, by Sir E. Strachey; but Mr. Arnold's is nearer to the rhythm and even to the sense of the Hebrew. If the rhythm of A.V. had to be renounced, why did not the Revisers adapt their English better to the Hebrew? Simply because they felt bound by the old rendering, here certainly inadequate, "thou abhorrest" (קָוֹן אֶתְהָ). "Inadequate" is, I hope, not a disrespectful word; a reference to Num. xxii. 3 will show that the leading idea of קָוֹן, when constructed with מִפְּנֵי, is "to be afraid"; for in that passage two notices from different documents are put side by side, in one of which the Moabitish feeling towards Israel is expressed by גִּיר, and in the other by קָוֹן. Next compare Ex. i. 12, where the same idiom is used as here; it appears from this passage (taken along with *vv.* 8-11) that קָוֹן expresses a fear intensified by fresh causes for strong dislike. It would seem as if a special theory of the "Christology of the Old Testament" dictated the rendering of A.V., which is however clearly wrong, (1) because the dislike and fear of the Jews was related not to the land of Pekah and Rezin, but to these kings themselves, and (2) because it is against Hebrew usage, as established by those two Pentateuch passages.

For another example, see the several revisions of ix. 5. Mr. Arnold's is as follows,—

For all the trampling of the warrior with confused noise, and the war-cloak rolled in blood—they shall be for burning and fuel of fire.

Now compare this with the freer movement and simple but not undignified English of Sir E. Strachey,—

For all the warrior's armour with its clang, and his garments rolled in blood, shall be for burning and food for fire.

We can hardly hesitate between them. The latter represents both sense and parallelism more clearly, and is supported in the main by the R.V., which runs thus,—

For all the armour of the armed man in the tumult, and the garments rolled in blood, shall soon be for burning, for fuel of fire.

“Supported in the main,” not in all points. **בְּרֵעַשׁ** might, no doubt, be expected to mean “with (its) clang,” if **סִחוּן** meant “armour.” This meaning, however, is not sufficiently proved. There is not the least reason (but a misplaced dislike of humble images) for rejecting the help of Aramaic (Syr. *sān*), and rendering, with R.V. marg., “Every boot of the booted warrior.” But I fear I cannot express admiration for the English either of R.V. or of R.V. marg., which seems to me needlessly awkward, while “garments” is a poor, colourless rendering of **שְׂמֹלָה** (cloak, *sagum*), though it fits well with the general term “armour.”

The tendency of these remarks is to show the great importance to the student of a judiciously chosen variety of translations of the Bible. A great deal too much has been said of the obscurity of the prophets; if their language is obscure, it is frequently owing either to the faultiness of the text or to a want of philological tact on the part of the translators. For the first of these drawbacks there is no remedy, if we adhere, as the Revisers were instructed to

do, to the Massoretic text (the references to the ancient versions in the margin seem far too few to meet the wants of a student, nor can the versions help us in half our perplexities). There is indeed only a partial remedy, at the best; and the free, not arbitrary, handling of the Hebrew text must begin in the scholar's commentary and not in a popular handbook.<sup>1</sup> The second can be remedied somewhat more easily. Philological tact can only be learned in a good school, and few of our theologians have time or opportunity for this. But the comparison of versions will develop a kind of instinct even in a weak Hebraist, if not preoccupied by the errors of antiquated commentaries. Without pretending that either criticism or exegesis fit to publish can be produced without sound scholarship, I think there is an element of truth in M. Renan's contention that mere literary students can sometimes detect the errors of a scholar; "les hébraïsants de l'ancienne école ont été à la fois les plus patients, les plus soigneux, et les moins clairvoyants des hommes."<sup>2</sup> It may be dangerous to tell this to every one; Arnolds and Stracheys, Astrucs and d'Eichthals, do not leave college every year. But many more, both of those who know but little Hebrew and those who know none at all, might become critics and exegetes for themselves (not for the public) by the discriminating use of modern<sup>3</sup> as well as ancient translations.

<sup>1</sup> The writer may be said to blame himself for inverting the proper order, and offering to the public first a popular edition of the Psalms involving such a "free handling," and only now a student's work on the same book with some attempted justification of his corrections. But circumstances are sometimes too strong for us. I see that Prof. Davidson anticipates the worst consequences from "free handling" (*EXPOSITOR*, Oct., 1887), but he evidently favours the Semitic idiom which prefers absolute to relative modes of expression.

<sup>2</sup> Article on Gustave d'Eichthal, *Journal des Savants*, Sept., 1887.

<sup>3</sup> Selden in his *Table Talk* and King James's translators in their Preface testify to the value set upon modern translations in the 17th century. The versions which were then modern may at the present day be of little importance. The same fate may sooner or later befall our own "modern" versions; but ignorance alone can depreciate the value of Gesenius's German and Rodwell's English translation of Isaiah, to mention no others.

Briefly and perhaps too drily I must now point out some of the Revisers' many careful alterations of the old version. In i. 27, A.V.'s *her converts* remains in the text; a rendering which reminds us somewhat of Rashi's paraphrase, עוֹשֵׂי תְשׁוּבָה, "those who perform penitence." In the one case a technical term of Christian, in the other one of Jewish theology is thrust upon the old prophet. Mr. Rodwell, in his scholarly version, gives *they that turn in her* (cf. lix. 20), R.V. margin, *they that return of her* (cf. xxxi. 6, Rodwell, but not R.V.).—In ii. 3, *the law* becomes in marg. *instruction*. The choice between the renderings will depend on our view of Isaiah's relation to the collections of laws. In v. 24 however the margin gives *teaching*.—ii. 16. A.V., *pleasant pictures* (supposing that the pictures are for superstitious purposes, as Ezek. viii. 12); R.V., *pleasant imagery* (cf. Rev. xxv. 11, R.V. marg.).—In iv. 2, *branch* remains in text, but marg. gives a choice between *shoot* and *sprout*, with great gain to intelligibility. Rodwell, "upgrowth"—doubtful English but good interpretation, צֶמַח being generally used collectively. *Earth* becomes *land*, following the parallel of Gen. iv. 3 (see the Hebrew).—Notice the pleasing assonance and striking picture in v. 17 b.; also the new light thrown on vi. 13.—In vii. 15, *that he may know* (Vulg., *ut sciat*) passes into the margin; *when he shall know* becomes the approved rendering. This has the authority alike of Hitzig, Ewald, and Delitzsch; cf. Judg. xx. 10 לְבוֹאֵם, "when they come" (A.V.). Kay and Bredenkamp, both somewhat fond of standing alone, still adhere to A.V.'s rend., which is however most difficult to explain, and is opposed by the Septuagint and the Targum (both these versions explain לְ "up to the time when").—viii. 12, *conspiracy* takes the place of *confederacy* (which makes no clear sense); cf. 2 Kings xi. 14, where A.V. and R.V. have "Treason," but de Wette "Conspiracy."—viii. 20, *it is because*, etc. (A.V.), is a bold attempt to remove the veil from

Isaiah's inner life. One of the psalmists says, "Jehovah my God doth enlighten my darkness" (Ps. xviii. 28), and another, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet" (Ps. cxix. 105). In the manner of Luther, our translators make a dash at the meaning, and promote edification at the cost of philology. *Light* is obviously too free; *no morning* points sadly to the future of these men. *Surely* in R.V. is doubtful; the accurate Delitzsch prefers the view given in marg. (*for whom, etc.*).—In the next verse, R.V.'s correction, *curse by their king, etc.*, is in agreement with Hebrew usage (1 Sam. xvii. 43; 2 Kings ii. 24). Some have felt however that the object of the curse ought to be named, and so, appealing to the analogy of הַתְּעַבֵּר בְּ, נִלְהֵם בְּ, retain the traditional view, which has been recorded in R.V. marg.—In ix. 1, the abruptness of the opening words of R.V. recalls that of the original; we expect "but in days to come," etc., but the prophet trusts to the reader to supply the missing link. Mr. Arnold's adaptation of the old framework of the sentence deserves chronicling however, *Nevertheless the dimness shall not remain unto that which was vexed.*—In ix. 3 we find one of those alterations which even that slighter church revision which I desiderated would certainly have included. *Thou hast increased their joy.* This is the reading of the Hebrew margin; the text-reading can only be rendered, "(whose) joy thou hadst not increased" (so Hitzig, and lately von Orelli). The order of the words is more natural according to the latter view, but the parallelism in the rest of this paragraph is so perfect that one can scarcely admit this view of the meaning. No alternative remains but to follow the late Prof. Selwyn, and read הַגִּיל (the Germans quote Studer for this, but Selwyn has the priority), or Krochmal, and read הַגִּילָה (lxv. 18). An unfettered reviser would therefore substitute for R.V.'s text and margin, *Thou hast multiplied exultation, thou hast increased joy.*—At ix. 8, the critical conscience of the



Revisers has expressed itself in a margin; אָבִי עֶדָי may be rendered literally "Father of eternity." Certainly the educated reader has a right to expect more. *Everlasting Father* may stand alone in a church-Bible, but a version which represents modern scholarship ought undoubtedly to have given one or two marginal renderings. The rend. *father (i.e. giver) of booty* has been advocated by some who may be accused of partisanship; but scholarship is bound to recognise it, nor is it objectionable from the point of view of believers in *progressive* revelation. See Isa. xxxiii. 23, and cf. liii. 12. One of the most learned of the Revisers is discontented with the word "everlasting" in this connexion, and proposes to render, *Father of the age to come, i.e. author of a new dispensation* (Dean Perowne, *Psalms*, ed. 5, vol. i., p. xxiv.); Bishop Lowth had rendered, *Father of the everlasting age*.

At ix. 8, an entirely new prophecy begins, demanding, from a literary point of view, a change in the style of the translator. Bickell has admirably illustrated this in his *Dichtungen der Hebräer*, i. 47-49: we are not bound, of course, to accept his metrical theory. The margins on vv. 11-14 are of much exegetical significance. Literally, they are undoubtedly correct. It is only those who regard the "tenses" as "prophetic perfects" who will feel grateful to R.V. for retaining the futures of A.V. The prophecy extends to x. 4—a most difficult verse, which in R.V. becomes, *They shall only bow down under the prisoners*, etc. Here we encounter one of the problems of translation. Are we to admit renderings which savour at all of exegesis? The Revisers have virtually answered in the negative; and yet, will not the Church expostulate? Who, listening to x. 4 in R.V., can attach a meaning to it? As M. Renan once said, "La traduction littéraire peut être la pire des trahisons"; but may we not say the same of "la traduction littérale"? And are we not thus gently drawn to the solu-

tion of the comprehensive problem of translation already proposed above, *viz.* that two versions are required, at any rate for the poetical and the prophetic writings? Or will any one say that the late D. G. Rossetti<sup>1</sup> is a poet worthy of more honour and more careful translation than David and Isaiah? Sir E. Strachey and Mr. Arnold, thinking chiefly of English, retain A.V.'s *Without me*; but, if the text is correct, there is surely no alternative for a translator who would be both scholarly and intelligible but to paraphrase, *There is nought but to bow down under the prisoners and fall under the slain?* Lagarde's emendation, obtained by a regrouping of the consonants of the text, and rendered, "Beltis stoops, Osiris is confounded," would be plausible if a reference to these foreign deities suited the text, and especially if there were evidence of their having been worshipped by heathenish Israelites.—At x. 27, the margin *by reason of fatness* deserves notice. It is undoubtedly correct, but makes no good sense. Bishop Lowth, whose historical importance is so great, ventures to correct in accordance with the Septuagint's ἀπὸ τῶν ὄμων ὑμῶν, which represents מַעַל שְׂכַמְיָם (not Lowth's impossible מִשְׂכַּמְיָם). But as the Bishop remarks elsewhere, the repetition of the same word (see first verse-half) "has a poverty and inelegance extremely unworthy of the prophet" (note on lix. 10). The words כּוֹפְנֵי שְׂמֹן, if no more, are evidently corrupt, and a radical cure is wanted.<sup>2</sup>—xi. 3, *And his delight shall be in the fear of Jehovah*, has the merit of smoothness and intelligibility. The difficulty of the idiom בְּיִהְיֶהוּ is acknowledged by the insertion of the margin; a literal rendering would have been useless without further explanation. It was not felt to be within the province of the Revisers to suggest the corruptness of the text.—Two small changes in

<sup>1</sup> The French translator of Rossetti's poems renders each of them first "littéralement" and then "littérairement."

<sup>2</sup> See Dr Robertson Smith's article, *Journal of Philology*, 1884.

xi. 10 clear up the meaning—*unto him*, and *his resting-place* (cf. Ps. cxxxii. 14, R.V.).—At xi. 11, for *islands*, the margin gives *coastlands*. This is important, because this alternative rendering is not repeated elsewhere in the R.V. of Isaiah. Lowth renders the whole phrase, אֲרָצוֹת הַיָּם, “western regions”; Rodwell, “coasts of the sea.” The equivalent in the Targum is נְגוּתַיִם, or simply נְגוּתַיִם, which Buxtorf renders *insula maris*, but which is clearly connected with the common Assyrian word *nagû*, “district.” That *distant* regions are meant, is clear from most of the contexts in which this phrase occurs (cf. lxvi. 19); so that Mr. Arnold’s equivalent “far lands” in some of the passages in Isa. xl.—lxvi. is a good one from the point of view of sense as well as (where A.V. has “islands”) of English rhythm. Rodwell in xli. 5, gives “countries”; is there a “charm” in the word “islands,” or may one express a regret that sense was not preferred by R.V. to convention? In Isa. xxiii. 2, 6, “island” is certainly out of place (so also in xx. 6, where even R.V. gives “coastland”); in Jer. xxv. 22, however, R.V.’s “isle” may perhaps stand if the “coastland” referred to be Cyprus, which is described by Esar-haddon as “lying in the midst of the sea” (*Records of the Past*, iii. 108).

I have ventured to insist on the variety of style requisite in a translation of Isaiah. Surely there is a fresh justification of this in the splendid poetry, suffused with emotion, of chap. xiv., following immediately upon the elaborate but cold description of the judgment in chap. xiii. Both chapters are finely rendered in A.V., and if, in spite of some five combinations of words, the English of xiv. 4–21 falls below the original, this is simply because Robert Lowth had not yet arisen to unfold the principle of parallelism. But how beautiful is the line, which even Lowth retains from A.V., *How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning* (v. 12), which is deftly corrected in R.V. by the

substitution of *daystar* for *Lucifer*. Rodwell has, “. . . Bright One, son of the dayspring,” which is equally clear and still nearer the Hebrew; had he given “thou Shining One,” he would have completely preserved the rhythmic effect so dear to Mr. Arnold’s heart. In *v.* 19, A.V. has done its best in the violent style of the elder Hebraists to make sense of a troublesome phrase; but the more natural rendering given in R.V. is at least as intelligible, *clothed with the slain*, i.e. not reverently attired in a winding-sheet, but on all sides pressed upon by other corpses. Rodwell, whose version of the ode is terse and energetic, renders the whole line, “Clad with sword-pierced slain, like a trampled carcass,” which gives more of the effect of the Hebrew than A.V. and R.V. Both Rodwell and the Revisers however have been hampered by regard for the Massoretic text. Why should this be held sacred? One proposed change is to transfer the four awkward words rendered “[those] that are thrust through with the sword” to the beginning of the next verse. This, which is at any rate the easiest change, is Ewald’s, and is adopted by Rodwell.

Two very questionable expressions in the A.V. of this ode have been retained in R.V. One is “golden city,” in *v.* 4. I have ventured elsewhere to speak of “inspired mistranslations”; certainly a phrase like this cannot but enthral those who give an undivided homage to our native speech. Thus we find Bishop Alexander singing in *Super Flumina*,

“And rises to the earth a cry  
Of triumph and of agony.  
Far over all the ancient East —  
‘How hath the golden city ceased!’  
In shadow of his dim blue room,  
High overhead in painted gloom,  
Like sunset cloud-encompassed, Bel  
Sleeps golden in his oracle.”

And yet, though the inscriptions speak of the temple of

Bel as "overlaid with glittering gold,"<sup>1</sup> and a poet might perhaps transfer the epithet "golden" to the city of the wondrous temple, I do not see how an expositor with the least tact can admit the rendering. Our Revisers doubtless were not professedly expositors. But even they have inserted in the margin, "Or, exactness," and but for their dislike of "perhaps" would I suppose have added, "Or, as the ancient versions perhaps read, violent dealing." The other doubtful legacy of A.V. is "Hell" (with a capital letter) in *v.* 9. Strictly the revisers ought no doubt to have substituted Sheól. But as long as "hell" remains in our version of the "Apostles' Creed," we may be thankful for at least one striking passage in the English Bible in which "hell" cannot mean "the place of torment" (comp. Preface to Revised Version). Bishop Alexander in his fine poem adopts "the grave" (A.V.'s margin), with great loss to the definiteness of his picture; why not have boldly adopted the not unmelodious Babylonian term Arâlû?

I trust I have not lingered too long on this fine poem. Surely God intended us to enjoy the records of His dealings with Israel as a literature. How much the Bible has suffered from what Roger Ascham calls, "a divorce between the tongue and the heart"! Why should we disparage the "tongues" of poets not inferior in their own styles to the singers of the West? As a rule, the translators of this noble ode seem to have been lifted up by its spirit. One curiosity may be noticed, *viz.* that whether Hebrew poetry be metrical or not, some translators of Isa. xiv. 4-21 have themselves shown a slight tendency to metre. A.V.'s hexameter line has been quoted already; Ewald in his version has four, and his English translator two (different ones from Ewald's). Is it possible that just as Michelet and (see Mr. Cabot's biography) Emerson used in certain moods to fall into metre unawares, so their sympathy with

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 95; cf. Perrot, *Chaldæan Art*, i. p. 379.



their original has made our translators involuntarily assume the outward bearing of poets? Are there any other hexameters in A.V. besides those in Ps. ii. 1, Isa. xiv. 12? I do not say that hexameters represent the Hebrew metre, or approximation to metre, either in Ps. ii. or Isa. xiv.

The problems of translation are in fact much more complicated than the old translators saw. The last clause of xiv. 31 could be rendered more idiomatically and not less faithfully than in A.V. and R.V. The latter gives a clearer form to A.V.'s view of the meaning, but one misses the winged short syllables in *none shall be alone*. Mr. Arnold feels the need of such, and renders, agreeing with R.V. marg., *none is away from his fellow in his ranks*. This is English. All at once a change of style occurs in the Hebrew; and no English could adequately represent this. Still it must be said that A.V. increased the difficulties by mistakes as to the point of time assumed in the Hebrew; Mr. Arnold too has been misled here. I need not say that R.V. has corrected the tenses, and the prophet becomes a poet again. Mr. Arnold has the advantage at xvi. 4 by adopting a more correct pointing of the text from the ancient versions, which R.V. only chronicles in the margin; but he leaves a manifest error in xvi. 6, rather happily corrected by R.V.'s vigorous rendering, *his boastings are nought*. Both have corrected A.V. in xvi. 13, in accordance with a deepened grammatical insight (cf. R.V. xlv. 8, xlv. 21). The vision passes at length into plain prediction, and two manifest improvements (neglected by Mr. Arnold) are due to R.V., in xvi. 12, 14.

In the "burden" or "oracle" of Damascus two marginal notes call for grateful mention, the record of the Septuagint reading in xvii. 9, and the rendering *plantings of Adonis* in xvii. 10. The former has been advocated in the commentary which corresponds most to the "Speaker's" in Germany; it had been adopted long before Orelli by Bishop Lowth.

The historical significance of the reading is not small. The Amorites are only twice referred to in the received text of the prophetic writings (Am. ii. 9, Ezek. xvi. 3); this passage would make a third. Notice the importance of this race in each of the three passages; notice too that both here and in Ezek. *l.c.* it is coupled with one other race, *viz.* here with the Hivites and in Ezekiel with the Hittites. Possibly "Hivites" in the Hebrew text of the Septuagint translator may have been corrupted from "Hittites," as some critics think was the case in the Hebrew of Jud. iii. 3. From a comparison of Josh. ix. 7 and 2 Sam. xxi. 2 on the one hand, and of Gen. xxxiv. 2, xlvi. 22 on the other, it would seem that to combine "Hivites" and "Amorites" is tautological. If so, I would venture to ask certain critics whether if "Hivite" was already a mere name to Isaiah, it is likely that "Hittite" was more than this to Ezekiel, and whether it is safe therefore to support theories of the extension of a "Hittite" empire into S. Palestine by Ezek. xvi. 3? That "Canaanite" and "Amorite" had a well defined acceptance is of course not in dispute. But I attach much more importance to the second marginal note, referring the young student for an explanation to my own work on Isaiah. The rendering mentioned may be regarded as certain (comp. Dr. Robertson Smith, *English Historical Review*, 1887, p. 307). It may compensate us to some extent for having to reject Lagarde's very brilliant correction of x. 4.

The famous prophecy on Ethiopia, with its introduction on the hostile nations, has been almost transformed in R.V.; and truly a radical cure was needed. The passage now fairly represents the views of the majority of scholars, except in xvii. 13 (*shall rush* for *rush*) and in xviii. 2, where very few will be found to endorse the rendering (perfectly possible, of course) *that meteth out*. The latter sprang, I presume, from the Company's pious reverence for A.V. A

*nation meted out* could not be retained, but it seemed barely possible that the Hebrew might mean *a nation that meteth out*, and so this was adopted in the text, and A.V.'s rendering relegated (with *dragged away and peeled*) into the margin. The effect of these corrections of the Revisers on popular exegesis ought in time to be considerable.—In the following chapter I can only notice two important renderings. In *v. 6*, which reads very differently in A.V., note especially *the streams (or, canals) of Egypt*, and in *v. 10* marg., *all they that make dams*. “Maçor” (מַצֹּר), as the punctuation vocalizes the traditional consonants, is simply a synonym for Mizraim, equivalent to the Assyrian Muşur. The margin on *v. 10* can hardly be right (see the first half of the verse), but is supported by the Targum and other Jewish authorities. A better margin would, I now venture to think, have been “those that prepare strong drink” (Weir, Klostermann, and Bredenkamp, after the Septuagint and Peshitto). Adopting this, however, we must obviously read just before שְׂתִיָּה “those that drink it” (so Bredenkamp); some other slight change may also be necessary.

Passing to chapter xxi., it is impossible to overlook a number of seemingly small changes which convert this obscure passage into one of the most vivid and lucid in the book. There is first the change of imperatives into presents in *v. 5*. A.V. and Luther followed the old versions, but on looking at the latter part of the verse in the Hebrew no one with any tact will justify them. The margin on *set the watch* (or rather “maintain the watch”), is *spread the carpets*. This has been supported by a reference to later Hebrew; the word for “watch” is in fact of unique occurrence. It is less probable however than the ordinary rendering. But exegesis has a word to say. The order “Maintain the watch,” mars the picture of the arrogant security of the Babylonians. Hence the latest critical commentator (Bredenkamp) proposes to transfer it to *v. 6*,

where the prophet himself is described as watching. In *v.* 8 we read in R.V., *he cried as a lion*. No doubt, A.V. is here wrong; I suppose our translators thought of the "lion" in *xv.* 9. But those who know what a number of errors, small and great, have crept into our Hebrew text will not be deterred from favouring Klostermann's plausible view that אריה is a corruption of אקרה, a variant for אקרה which intruded into the text. "He cried (as) a lion," is a possible rendering; אריה may be the "accusative of manner," which is now used very freely in Arabic (Prof. W. Wright quotes "Zeid charged, a lion," *i.e.* lion-wise), but also with more moderation in Hebrew (see Ps. xxii. 13, Heb. 14). But the sense of "he cried lion-wise," is not perfectly clear; Rev. x. 3 referred to by Delitzsch, does not help us, I fear. The Septuagint, in perplexity, gives Οὐπλαν—a non-word. Lastly, to illustrate R.V.'s view of the construction in *v.* 7, comp. Dr. Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, § 149.

The correction in xxiii. 13 was as necessary as any in the Revised Bible. The rendering of A.V. not only spoils the parallelism of the verse but implies an exegetical view which is opposed to history. The only natural rendering is that of R.V., and the historical allusion is cleared up by the cuneiform inscriptions (see *Records of the Past*, vii. 59, 61). Once, however, I confess that I was attracted by Ewald's ingenious emendation "Canaanites" for "Chaldeans"; the German *Speaker's Commentary* (if I may call it so) has indeed quite lately given weighty support to it.—In chap. xxiv. "earth" and "land" seem used indiscriminately in A.V.; with great fairness, R.V. retains the alternative rend. "land" as a margin for *vv.* 1, 3, 4, etc., but renders "earth" in the text throughout. In *v.* 15, *fires* (or rather, as R.V. marg. expresses the meaning by preference, *lights* = "regions of light") becomes *east*; a rare deviation into the province of exegetical paraphrase. In *v.* 16, *I pine away* takes the

place of *my leanness* (in Ps. cvi. 15, "leanness" = "pining sickness").

Chap. xxvi. is, in spite of its obscurity, so familiar to the English reader that but few corrections were ventured upon; the margin however is full of useful emendations. Who could think of altering *v. 3* in a version meant to be read aloud? Yet the rhythm and construction of the Hebrew are better reproduced in the margin. In *v. 14* a scrupulousness which the sacred writers themselves were far from feeling (or was it simply to avoid suggesting non-Semitic analogies?) kept the Revisers from giving the preference to *shades* over *deceased* as a rendering of *refaim*; "shades" however finds a home in the margin (as in Ps. lxxxviii. 11). In *v. 19*, Kimchi's explanation *together with my dead body* is rejected in favour of that suggested by the Targum, *my dead bodies* (the singular being used collectively); the Church, and not the prophet, is the speaker.—In chap. xxvii. (omitting minor alterations), observe the dramatic vividness of the R.V. of *vv. 4, 5*. Some may regret that the reading חֹמָה "wall" for חַמָּה "wrath" was not mentioned in the margin; but this would have required a long explanatory note. In *v. 8*, a fine phrase, but a mistranslation, has disappeared; in *v. 9* (an important passage) one view of the sense is given, though not the only one worth considering (see Grätz, *Monatsschrift für Gesch. des Judenthums*, 1886, p. 21, and cf. all this scholar's suggestions on this partly corrupt section).

Chaps. xxviii.—xxxiii., belong together—a splendid specimen of Isaiah's various styles. Verses 7–13, of chap. xxviii. bring before us a truly vivid scene from the prophet's personal experience. With a few quotation commas, and brief paraphrastic notes, and perhaps a slight change in *v. 12*, R.V. would be all that the student wants. Notice also the good effect of the insertion of the word "con-



tinually" in *v.* 24, and the very striking margin on *v.* 28; also the happy paraphrase in the margin on xxix. 13. How successful too is the vigorous correction of xxix. 16 and xxx. 7, not rejecting A.V.'s phraseology, but simply adapting it better to the construction in the Hebrew! Nor must we omit to record a *Topheth* for *Topheth* (xxx. 33), and the striking close of Isaiah's definitions of character, *But the liberal deviseth liberal things; and in liberal things shall he continue.*

If time allowed, I should like to dwell at some length on the careful treatment of chap. xxxiii. (an epilogue, says Delitzsch, added to the preceding cycle of prophecy in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah), one of the finest sections of Isaiah. The change of *hypocrites* (A.V.) to *godless ones* is surely not unimportant; Gataker, an ornament of Puritan scholarship, showed long ago by an examination of passages how unsuitable the rendering "hypocrite" was, maintaining that "per totam paginam sacram verbum חנף in profani ac polluti notione, citra contradictionem ullam fere, perpetuo usurpatur."<sup>1</sup> "Godless" however well suits the contexts, and agrees with the Septuagint rendering (both here and sometimes in Job). A phrase of infinite suggestiveness to devout readers has passed, with the change of *the land* into *a land*, into the margin upon xxxiii. 17; but truth is better than a suggestion of what could not have been referred to by Isaiah, especially in this context. The *far-stretching land* of course means the land of the Jews, which has been darkened with the swarms of Assyrian warriors, but which can now be seen far and wide in its full beauty. But may it not mean more than this? Some think that an extension of the borders of the land of Israel is a part of Isaiah's promise. Certainly this view does justice to the use of the same Hebrew phrase (lit., "land of distances") in Jer.

<sup>1</sup> *Adversaria Miscellanea* (1659), p. 249.

viii. 14 (cf. "distances of the earth," Isa. viii. 9); it may at any rate serve to justify the marginal rendering.

Chaps. xxxiv., xxxv., form an independent prophecy, chiefly valuable to Christian readers for its lovely picture of the land of the redeemed (cf. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 318-320). Yet I think that those who are "grieved for the affliction of [Israel]" will be grateful for the margin "Heb. *Lilith*" on xxxiv. 14, which will remind them of the load of "superstitious vanities" which oppresses the minds of many Jews even on English soil. To them, *Lilith* is a present danger; but the prophet relegated "the night-monster" to the uninhabited desert, the horrors of which could be dimly imagined by the help of the mythopœic fancy. Chap. xxxv. was doubtless too familiar a passage to be roughly treated by the Revisers. The old rhythm remains; scholarship has done its best however in the margin. Not that any scholarship could give a certain view of the prophet's meaning in v. 8. Among the marginal renderings, there are two which deserve special notice; "the land and the book" must ever be taken together, and no one, in a Bible for home-use, would be satisfied with A.V.'s *rose* (xxxv. 1) and *parched ground* (v. 7). Whether the *autumn crocus* suits S. of Sol. ii. 1 as well as the narcissus may be doubted. But no one can question the accuracy of *mirage*. Would not "phantom-lake" have been more intelligible English than *glowing sand* for the text of v. 7? Australian readers of the Bible (as well as old Palestine travellers) have a claim to consideration; Mr. Kendall, an Australian poet, gives "mock-waters" as a descriptive term for this optical illusion in his poem *On a Cattle-Track* (see *Contemporary Review*, Sept., 1887).

The "writing of king Hezekiah" (xxxviii. 9-20) is of course presented in parallel lines, in accordance with the laudable custom mentioned by the Revisers in their pre-faces. The version now offers a fair compromise between

the standards of that Bible for the Church and that Bible for the educated which I ventured in my unpractical way to wish for. In xxxviii. 10 we get the fine expression *in the noontide of my days*, which even Mr. Arnold will admit to be finer gold than Kimchi's and A.V.'s *in the cutting-off of my days*. The margin *tranquillity* represents a view widely held, and supported by the names of Gesenius and Delitzsch; the expression *the residue of my years* favours the explanation in the text. How much more finely, too, the verse reads, now that *I said* is separated from what follows, as in v. 11! But how unfortunate that the obscure phrase *the gates of the grave* could not be changed into "the gates of Sheól" (or, "of hell," cf. xiv. 9; or, "of Hades," cf. Matt. xvi. 18, R.V.)!—In v. 12, *mine age* is left in the text, but the more vivid *mine habitation* has found recognition in the margin. On the rend. *I have rolled up*, see Dr. Kay's eloquent paraphrase in the *Speaker's Commentary*.—In v. 13, R.V.'s *I quieted myself* is rather uncertain, though supported by Gesenius and Delitzsch; cf. Ps. cxxxi. 2, "I have stilled and quieted my soul."—In v. 15 the fine expression, *I shall go softly all my years*, copied by Mr. Browning, is shown to be a possible mis-translation by the margin, *go as in solemn procession* (see Ps. xlii. 4). The royal poet imagines himself pacing along with the leisurely, careless step familiar to us in Italian pictures.—In v. 17, the fine pregnant Hebrew phrase, *thou hast loved my soul from the pit*, is recorded in the margin; cf. Ps. xviii. 21, "and have not by sin forsaken my God" (De Witt), or more literally, "and have not sinned away from my God."

The second part of Isaiah differs considerably both in style and in thought from the first, and demands a separate paper.

T. K. CHEYNE.

(To be continued.)

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE ON THE NEW  
TESTAMENT.

IN New Testament literature the Continental press has been even more than usually productive during the period which has elapsed since our last summary. In addition to a very large number of books, we have an uncommon wealth of important papers in the various theological journals. We can overtake at present only a part of what has appeared. We select those publications which call for more immediate notice. Not a few, scarce less deserving attention, must lie over for another opportunity.

I. TEXTUAL CRITICISM.—One of the most interesting contributions to this department is again made by M. Pierre Batiffol. We have already referred to the account which he gave of the new Albanian manuscript in the *brochure* issued at Rome in 1885 under the title *Evangeliorum Codex Græcus Purpureus Beratinus*, etc.<sup>1</sup> He follows this up now by a larger publication on the documentary treasures of Berat.<sup>2</sup> To this insignificant Turkish town, planted by the gorges of the old Illyrian Apsus, we are indebted for some valuable additions to the select class of purple manuscripts. M. Batiffol gives a brief description of two of these,—the *Liturgia Argentea*, which is in the possession of the metropolitan, M. Anthime Alexoudis, and the *Codex Aureus Anthimi*, which is named after the same prelate. He devotes the volume mainly however to the third of these Albanian manuscripts, the remarkable *Codex Beratinus* Φ. He revises and supplements his former statements in a number of points, and asks us to take his view of the document from this publication, not from the earlier. His examination of the scription leads him to the conclusion that Φ resembles in this respect the St. Petersburg palimpsest I<sup>7</sup>, and the type of writing characteristic of the beginning of the sixth century. He holds by his former opinion, that the *Codex Beratinus* is somewhat older than the *Codex Rossanensis*. In this he is at issue with Gebhardt, who contends for the priority of Σ over Φ. He finds itacism abundantly at work in the codex, but also certain dialectic peculiarities. The text is printed at the end of the book, and its general character is very carefully estimated. It

<sup>1</sup> See THE EXPOSITOR, May, 1886, p. 391.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Manuscrits Grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le Codex Purpureus* Φ. Par Pierre Batiffol, etc. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1886.)

is marked to a large extent by paraphrastic readings. Some of these are of considerable interest. In Matthew ix. 28, for example, it inserts *δεομενοι* after *τυφλοι*. It agrees in this with certain cursives (5, 123, 124, etc.), but is the only uncial known to make the addition. In various passages, such as Matthew xxiv. 45, Mark ii. 18, etc., it deserves to be consulted for its bearing upon Westcott and Hort's employment of *conflate* readings. Now and again it exhibits traces of intentional change. The text, according to M. Batiffol, is fundamentally Syrian, with a decided infusion of Western readings. He pronounces the non-Syrian element to be analogous to that in N, Σ, and the prototype now represented by the cursives, 13, 69, 124, 346.

Few students of the text can compete with the diligent Norwegian J. Belsheim in the limited but important field which he cultivates. His work in a branch of inquiry in which the Bishop of Salisbury, Professor Sanday, and other English scholars take a special interest, has been of the most helpful and reliable kind. He adds to his previous services in the cause of the pre-Hieronymian Latin text a careful edition, the *editio princeps*, of the text of one of the Corbei manuscripts<sup>1</sup>—a codex hitherto very imperfectly known. It may be noticed in passing that Belsheim and Batiffol by no means agree in the views which they take of some recent questions. Batiffol recognises the value of Belsheim's editorial work, but allows much less weight to his critical opinions. This appears in the case of the *Codex Theodora*. Belsheim, who has worked with great care at this attractive document, and to whom we owe a transcription of its text of Mark, puts it in the ninth century. Batiffol declares it simply impossible that it can be so old. Looking to the whole style of writing, he declines to carry it higher than the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. Wattenbach would bring it down even to the twelfth.

In connexion with the subject of old Latin texts, mention should also be made of a paper by Dr. J. Dräseke, of Wandsbeck.<sup>2</sup> It deals with a manuscript of which even Rönisch has little to tell, one of those formerly in the monastery of Bobbio, and now in Turin

<sup>1</sup> *Codex f<sup>o</sup> Corbeiensis; sive quatuor evangelia ante Hieronymum latine translata e codice membranaceo quinto vel sexto sæculo, ut videtur, scripto, qui in Bibliotheca "Nationali" Parisiensi asservatur. Nunc primum ed. J. B.* (Christiania. 1887.)

<sup>2</sup> See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1887, Heft i., etc.



—designated Codex Taurinensis F. vi. 1. Dräseke puts us in possession of what he has gathered from certain communications from Bernardino Peyron, which appeared as far back as 1873 in the Italian journal *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica*. The manuscript is of considerable interest to the palæographer and the student of philosophy, as well as to the critic. A few of its leaves are palimpsests. Chemical appliances have brought out the text of some philosophical writing in Greek. Part of the *Parmenides* of Plato, for example, is legible. The codex consists of some ninety-four leaves in small quarto. It is referred to the sixth century, if not to the fifth, and appears to be made up of the work of three different scribes. It gives a text of the Gospels in Latin, which is pronounced to be one of the *Vetus Latina*, and to approach most nearly to the type given in Bianchini's *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latine Versionis Antiquæ*. The most remarkable thing about it is the introduction of prefaces to the several Gospels. Ferdinand Fleck found such prefaces attached to the Gospels in a codex belonging to the Laurentian Library in Florence, which he described in his *Anecdota* in 1837 as *opus pretiosissimum et in Europa unicum*. The Laurentian codex preserved the prefaces to the synoptists in good form, but that to the fourth Gospel only in a mutilated condition. This Turin codex makes what is an extremely rare phenomenon at least not an absolutely singular one. It gives prefaces to Mark, Luke, and John. In all probability it contained originally one also for Matthew. The manuscript however is unfortunately incomplete here. As it now reads, it begins at Matthew xiii. 35.

Another question which has been raised again of late is the subject of a paper by Dr. F. Zimmer, of Königsberg.<sup>1</sup> That is the relation in which the *Codex Augiensis* and the *Codex Boernerianus* stand to each other—a question of obvious importance, particularly as regards the claims of F. Wetstein, as is well known, regarded it as more probable that G was dependent on F than *vice versa*. Scrivener, in editing F, rejected the idea of any such direct relation between the two, and held them both to be representatives of a lost codex. Tischendorf and Tregelles agreed on the whole with Scrivener. Professor Hort holds strongly for the immediate dependence of F in its Greek text upon G. Dr. Zimmer now comes forward in the interest of Professor Hort's views, and

<sup>1</sup> See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1887, Heft i.

claims to establish it as beyond doubt that F is simply a transcript of G. He shows that the resemblance between the two, especially in the matter of omissions, is too remarkable to admit of explanation on Scrivener's theory. By a careful analysis of a number of crucial passages, among which may be named 1 Corinthians vi. 6, 15, 1 Thessalonians v. 23, and Galatians ii. 17, etc. he endeavours to prove, first, that G cannot have copied F, and, secondly, that F must have followed G.

Other publications belonging to this head must be dismissed at present with bare mention. The Abbé Martin continues the issue of his lectures,<sup>1</sup> in which he expounds at length the conservative view of the science. The industrious editor of Tischendorf furnishes an important communication on the *externalia* of the Greek manuscripts, the method of their preparation, the connexion of the leaves, etc.<sup>2</sup> Gebhardt's very useful Greek New Testament on the basis of Tischendorf, with the readings of Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, etc., appears in its third edition.<sup>3</sup>

II. BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, INTRODUCTION, ETC.—We welcome a new edition of the handbook on the theology of the New Testament by the late Dr. J. J. van Oosterzee, of Utrecht.<sup>4</sup> Prepared originally as a manual for the guidance of theological students, it met with a large measure of acceptance in Germany and England as well as in Holland. In the new and enlarged German edition it will still be useful as a concise synopsis of inquiry in an exceptionally rich and important province of biblical study.

A book of a different and more independent order on the same subject is the treatise of the late Professor C. F. Schmid, of Tübingen,<sup>5</sup> the *quondam* colleague of Baur, and the teacher of theologians of the mark of Dorner and Oehler. It is a satisfaction to see it in its fifth edition. Dr. Heller, who has continued the editorial duties which were discharged for a length of time by Weizsäcker, has wisely decided to give us Schmid's own work,

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testam. Partie pratique. T. 5. Leçons professées à l'École Supérieure de Théol. de Paris, etc.* (Paris, 1886.)

<sup>2</sup> *Les cahiers des Manuscrits Grecs.* A paper submitted to the French Academy of Inscriptions.

<sup>3</sup> *Novum Testamentum Græce, etc.* Illustravit Oscar de Gebhardt. Editio stereotypa tertia. (Tauchnitz: Leipzig, 1886.)

<sup>4</sup> *Die Theologie des neuen Testaments. Ein Handbuch für akademische Vorlesungen, etc.* 2 verm. Aufl. (Bremen, 1886.)

<sup>5</sup> *Biblische Theologie des neuen Testaments.* Hrsg. von Dr. C. Weizsäcker. 5 Aufl., besorgt durch Dr. A. Heller. (Leipzig, 1886.)

with few additions or alterations. The subject therefore is not brought up to date. But this lack is counterbalanced by the advantage of having the author's construction of the ideas of the New Testament exactly as he himself originally interpreted them. Though the treatise diverges in some respects from more recent studies in its conception of what belongs to this particular science and in its view of the *lie* of certain ideas in the several sections of the New Testament, it is well worth consideration still. It is one of the most satisfactory products of the believing side of the Tübingen theology, uniting loyalty to the historic spirit with modesty and with a clear, firm faith in revelation.

In the *Biblical Theology* of the late Von Hofmann, of Erlangen,<sup>1</sup> we have a still more original handling of this discipline. It forms the concluding volume of his large and unfinished work on the history, contents, and theology of New Testament Scripture. It has been prepared from the author's manuscripts and from college lectures by his pupil, Professor Volck, of Dorpat. It suffers from the disadvantages which inevitably connect themselves with a work prepared, with whatever care on the compiler's part, from material of this kind. But with all such drawbacks, it remains a contribution of more than usual interest. Von Hofmann could touch no subject in the traditional fashion. Even this imperfect representation of his studies in New Testament teaching bears the impress of a mind which could not but strike out a path of its own. In the method pursued, the exposition of particular testimonies, and the conclusion to which all is brought, we come upon what is novel and provocative of reflection, if not always certain to carry the general suffrage.

Weizsäcker's book on the *Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*,<sup>2</sup> which forms another volume of the *Mohrsche Sammlung*, deserves extended examination. It must be enough here to notice some of the critical conclusions which are of greatest interest. Taking the apostolic age proper to terminate with the year 70 A.D., and allowing what remains of the first century to be apostolic only in a very modified sense, Weizsäcker pronounces the great bulk of the New Testament literature to be non-apostolic. The Epistle

<sup>1</sup> *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht.* Von Dr. J. C. K. von Hofmann. Elfter Theil. "Biblische Theologie des neuen Testaments." (Nördlingen, 1886.)

<sup>2</sup> *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche.* Von Carl Weizsäcker. (Freiburg i. B., 1866.)

to the Hebrews has in all probability a spurious close in chap. xiii. 18-24, and as a whole is not much older than the First Epistle of Clement. Neither the fourth Gospel nor the Apocalypse is by the Apostle John. The whole Johannine writings indeed, as well as those of James and Peter, are dealt with as not genuine. The Apocalypse, further, has probably sustained interpolation from some post-apostolic hand. The epistles of the captivity (with one exception) are spurious, like the pastoral epistles. In the matter of Paul's conversion, we have to distinguish sharply between Paul's own version of it and the more fanciful account by Luke. The event itself was miraculous in the sense of being a miracle in the inner world of consciousness. The narratives of the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the miracle of Pentecost, and other wonders, require to be cleared of the entanglements of legend and Jewish symbolism. On the other hand, not only are the four great Pauline epistles admitted to be genuine, but those to the Thessalonians, and even that to the Philippians as well—a concession which strips this very radical criticism of much of its apparent strength. The credibility of the decree of the convention of Apostles recorded in Acts xv., and that of the tradition of the Ephesian residence of John, are admitted. The last thirty years of the first century, though not apostolic, are to be regarded as the period of John. This is all that is attempted by one of the most keen-witted critics in the way of a *via media* between the old Tübingen position and the ordinary view. The result has its significance for both sides.

Among minor publications, we may refer to Paul Christ's essay on the *New Testament Doctrine of Prayer*.<sup>1</sup> The essay received the prize of the *Haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der Christlichen Religion*, and is offered as a contribution to an intelligent estimate of primitive Christianity. It is written nevertheless from an extreme Tübingen standpoint. It is of value chiefly as showing to how little Christian prayer comes to be reduced under the pressure of certain critical principles, and what difficulty is experienced, even by an able and, on the whole, open-minded adherent, in accommodating the general strain of New Testament ideas to these principles.

We may mention also a new discussion of the question of the original language of Matthew's Gospel by Licentiate Dietrich

<sup>1</sup> *Die Lehre von Gebet nach dem neuen Testament, etc.* (Leiden, 1886.)

Gla;<sup>1</sup> a monograph by J. M. Usteri, a Zürich Privat-docent, on Peter's teaching on the Descent to Hades,<sup>2</sup> in which he contends that the passage in the First Epistle points to a manifestation of Christ to the departed in Hades, and especially to those of Noah's generation, but admits a different construction for the section in the Second Epistle; and another brief monograph of considerable interest, by the same writer, on our Lord's use of the title *Son of man*.<sup>3</sup>

III. COMMENTARIES, ETC.—The new issue of *Meyer* proceeds apace, and with various degrees of liberty in the handling of the original. It is an extraordinary testimony to Meyer's work that edition after edition continues to be called for, notwithstanding that the master hand can no more touch it. The Fourth Gospel,<sup>4</sup> which was worked over in 1879 by Bernhard Weiss with a thoroughness that seemed to put Meyer himself in the background, has again come under the same editorial pen. The changes in this seventh edition however are comparatively moderate. Weiss himself avers that they are limited to matters of subordinate importance. The more recent commentaries however, by Keil and Schanz, are compared throughout. The Epistle to the Galatians<sup>5</sup> also appears in a seventh edition by the scholar who brought out the sixth edition in 1880, Professor Sieffert, of Erlangen. Careful use is made here of the most important monographs and papers which have been recently published, as well as of the commentaries by Holsten, Wörner, Philippi, etc., and all is kept within the limits of what is due from editor to author. The Epistle to the Ephesians is issued in its sixth edition,<sup>6</sup> revised by Dr. Woldemar Schmidt, of Leipzig; and the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon,<sup>7</sup> in the fifth

<sup>1</sup> *Die Original Sprache des Matthäus-evangeliums. Historisch-kritische Untersuchung.* (Paderborn, 1887.)

<sup>2</sup> *Hinabgefahren zur Hölle. Eine Wiedererwägung der Schriftstellen 1 Pet. iii. 18-22 und 2 Pet. iii. 6.* (Zürich, 1886.)

<sup>3</sup> *Die Selbst-bezeichnung Jesu als des Menschen Sohn.* (Zürich, 1886.)

<sup>4</sup> *Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das neue Testament.* Von Dr. H. A. W. Meyer. *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Johannes.* Siebente Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. Bernhard Weiss. (Göttingen, 1886.)

<sup>5</sup> *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief an die Galater.* Siebente Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. Friedr. Sieffert. (Göttingen, 1886.)

<sup>6</sup> *Kritisch exeg. Handbuch über den Brief an die Epheser.* Sechste verbesserte Auflage, bearbeitet von Dr. Woldemar Schmidt. (Göttingen, 1886.)

<sup>7</sup> *Kritisch exeg. Handbuch über die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser, und*



edition, by the hand of Professor Franke, of Kiel. In the case of the last-named section of Meyer's *Commentary*, a very radical revision was contemplated, which circumstances prevented.

Professor Kübel, of Tübingen, gives us a fourth and enlarged edition of the New Testament section of his *Bibelkunde*.<sup>1</sup> The volume is made up of a series of exegetical studies of the weightiest and most difficult passages from the Gospels and other New Testament books. The essays are short, and free from all learned apparatus or terminology. They are in general remarkably interesting, and sometimes strike upon rich veins of exposition.

Professor Rübiger of Breslau published a book on the two Epistles to Corinth<sup>2</sup> so long ago as 1847. After well-nigh forty years it reaches a second edition; it thus obtains a long delayed but well-merited honour. The strength of the volume lies in what it has to offer on the vexed question of the parties in the Church of Corinth. It can scarcely be said that we are much nearer unanimity of opinion on that problem after all the discussions of these forty years. Dr. Rübiger subjects the leading theories to a very acute criticism, and in view of all that has passed holds with increased confidence that the idea of a distinct Christ-party is groundless. The summary of results in the last few pages regarding the condition of the Church and the object of the two epistles deserves attention.

Dr. Heinrici, of Marburg, follows up the weighty volume which he published in 1880 on the First Epistle to the Corinthians by another, similar in method, on the Second Epistle.<sup>3</sup> Both are extensive and searching studies, which leave little that is of any importance unnoticed. They deserve a place beside the commentaries of Godet, Meyer, and Edwards. They differ from all three however in method, and aim at more. Like its predecessor, this book addresses itself largely to the solution of the historical

*Philemon*. Fünfte Auflage, völlig umgearbeitet von Dr. A. H. Franke. (Göttingen, 1886.)

<sup>1</sup> *Bibelkunde*, etc. Von Robert Kübel, etc. *Zweiter Theil*, *Das neue Testament*. Vierte vermehrte Auflage. (Stuttgart, 1886.)

<sup>2</sup> *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Inhalt der beiden Briefe des Apostels Paulus an die Korinthische Gemeinde*, etc. Von Dr. J. F. Rübiger, etc. (Breslau, 1886.)

<sup>3</sup> *Das Zweite Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinther*. Erklärt von Dr. C. F. Heinrici. (Berlin, 1887.)

problems, and is of interest for the attempt which it makes to reproduce in the light of solid fact the process by which a primitive Christian Church originated and grew and exhibited its life.

The *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*, edited by Strack and Zöckler, has made a fair beginning. Two sections of the New Testament division have come to hand. The one embraces the synoptical Gospels,<sup>1</sup> which are undertaken by Professor Nösgen, of Rostock. The other is devoted to the fourth Gospel and the book of Acts, and bears the names of Professors Luthardt and Zöckler.<sup>2</sup> The volumes satisfy the design of the series on the whole very creditably. The exegetical notes, which are thrown to the foot of the page, are as brief as may be. It is the same with what is offered on matters of criticism and introduction. In the case of a veteran in Johannine literature and exegesis like Luthardt, the plan secures in briefest compass and simplest form the thrice sifted results of mature scholarship.

S. D. F. SALMOND.

<sup>1</sup> *Neues Testament. Erste Abtheilung: Die Evangelien nach Matthäus, Markus, und Lukas.* Erläutert von Dr. C. F. Nösgen, etc. (Nördlingen, 1886.)

<sup>2</sup> *Neues Testament. Zweite Abtheilung: Das Evangelium nach Johannes und die Apostel-geschichte.* Erläutert von Dr. E. C. Luthardt und Dr. Otto Zöckler. (Nördlingen, 1886.)

## BREVIA.

**Sisera and Jael.**—A writer in the October number of THE EXPOSITOR quotes with approval a suggestion of Captain Conder, that Jael's murder of Sisera was in revenge for the insult to her involved in his entrance into her tent. Dr. Stuart suggests that Sisera, "by repairing to her tent, . . . has forfeited his life," and has offered to her a "heinous affront."

But it is worthy of note, that of any affront offered by Sisera to Jael there is no hint whatever either in the Song of Deborah or in the narrative of the book of Judges. Yet, had such affront been a motive of Jael's action, so important an element could not have been in both places passed over in silence.

Moreover, the fugitive entered Jael's tent by her respectful and repeated invitation, *Turn in, my lord, turn in.* Surely acceptance of such an invitation, especially when it offered a way of escape from imminent death, could not be looked upon as an insult. Indeed Jael's words, *Fear not,* suggest that Sisera hesitated to accept her invitation.

Again, it is by no means certain that Sisera intended to enter Jael's tent. Her language suggests rather that he did not. The English words *turn in* are much less definite than their Hebrew counterpart, which almost always, or always, denotes a turning away from a path one is, or ought to be, pursuing. For example, we have it in Judges xiv. 8, in reference to Samson, who "*turned aside* to see the carcase of the lion." So in 1 Samuel vi. 12, of the cattle drawing the ark, who "*turned not aside* to the right hand or to the left." It is often used metaphorically, as in 1 Samuel xii. 20, "*Turn not aside* from following the Lord." The use of such a word suggests that Sisera was merely passing by the tent.

Dr. Stuart speaks of Sisera as running towards the tent of Jael instead of towards that of her husband. But it is doubtful whether they had separate tents. The tent is called that of Jael because she was there, whereas apparently Heber was away. Had he been near, Jael would certainly have told him of her deed, and he would have joined her exultation when showing the corpse to Barak. (This last seems to have invaded no sanctuary by going into the same tent to see his enemy's corpse.) It is most unlikely that a man flying for his life would notice whether the tent was that of a woman or of a man. And we must remember

that Jael was inside the tent, and therefore probably out of sight : for she came out to meet Sisera.

I notice with regret the theological bias which, lying on the surface of his paper, hides from the writer the extreme unlikeness of his explanation. This is revealed in the "sense of relief and gratitude" with which he welcomes Captain Conder's suggestion. A real explanation of Deborah's commendation of Jael's treachery would be indeed welcome to many. But we must carefully sift all relief offered, and ruthlessly reject whatever fails under our scrutiny. Many Bible difficulties test most severely our loyalty to strict scientific methods. But, in time, truth will vindicate itself. And to wait for that vindication is the only course worthy of the servants of Him who said, "I am the Truth."

JOSEPH AGAR BEEV.

---

NOTE ON PERSONAL "REMINISCENCES OF EDWARD IRVING" BY THE WRITER OF THEM.

IN the September EXPOSITOR (p. 220) an expression occurs regarding Mr. A. J. Scott's religious beliefs which I regret having used. It expressed indeed what information from more than one quarter seemed to put beyond doubt. But even if so, it had better have been unsaid of one of rare ability and undoubted sincerity in everything. From information since received I have been led to understand that those who are themselves very true Christians, and knew Mr. Scott well in his later days, regarded him in an entirely different light from what is there expressed. To me this is a far more pleasant recollection of Mr. Scott than that which my information had unhappily left; and as I gladly embrace it, I could wish the expression deleted.

DAVID BROWN.

---

# INDEX.

---

	PAGE
<b>Rev. Principal Joseph Angus, D.D.</b>	
Of Scripture Terms used to express "Eternity," with Special Reference to Future Punishment . . . . .	274
<b>Rev. Professor Joseph Agar Beet.</b>	
Crucified and Risen with Christ . . . . .	140
Christ Crucified and Risen . . . . .	372
Sisera and Jael . . . . .	471
<b>Rev. Professor W. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D.</b>	
Homiletical Features of the Epistle to the Romans . . . . .	99
<b>Rev. Principal David Brown, D.D.</b>	
Personal Reminiscences of Edward Irving . . . . .	216, 257
Fellowship with God . . . . .	397
<b>Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.</b>	
Asking in Christ's Name . . . . .	191
<b>Rev. F. H. Chase, M.A.</b>	
Note on the Word <i>vaos</i> in Ephesians ii. 21. . . . .	318
<b>Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.</b>	
The Revised Version of the Old Testament:	
The Book of Psalms. II. . . . .	38
The Book of Isaiah. I. . . . .	442
Recent Books . . . . .	320
<b>Very Rev. R. W. Church, D.C.L.</b>	
The Idolatry of Civilized Men . . . . .	28
<b>Rev. Professor S. Ives Curtiss, D.D., Ph.D.</b>	
The History of Israel from the Standpoint of Modern Criticism . . . . .	321
<b>Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.</b>	
The Prophet Amos.—II. The People of Israel . . . . .	161
The Book of Proverbs in the Revised Version . . . . .	381
<b>Rev. Professor F. Delitzsch, D.D.</b>	
The Royal Court of Adiabene . . . . .	130
<b>Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.</b>	
Ezra . . . . .	53
Nehemiah . . . . .	287
Malachi . . . . .	414
Recent English Literature on the New Testament . . . . .	159, 232
Recent Books . . . . .	319



	PAGE
<b>Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.</b>	
Job and Solomon . . . . .	71
<b>E.</b>	
Dr. Delitzsch's Assyrian Dictionary . . . . .	228
<b>Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, B.A.</b>	
Paul and Titus at Jerusalem . . . . .	435
<b>Rev. Professor F. Godet, D.D.</b>	
The Thanks of an Apostle . . . . .	113
<b>Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D.</b>	
The Epistle to Philemon :	
IV. . . . .	150
V. . . . .	180
VI. . . . .	297
<b>Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D.</b>	
The Origin of the Christian Ministry . . . . .	339
<b>T. E. Page, M.A.</b>	
A Problem in Criticism . . . . .	173
<b>A. M. S.</b>	
Thoughts . . . . .	314
<b>Rev. Professor G. Salmon, D.C.L., F.R.S., Corr. Inst.,     France.</b>	
The Christian Ministry . . . . .	2
<b>Rev. Professor S. D. F. Salmond, D.D.</b>	
Recent Foreign Literature on the New Testament . . . . .	462
<b>G. A. Simcox, M.A.</b>	
The Latter Rain . . . . .	1
The Origin of the Christian Ministry . . . . .	198
<b>Rev. A. Moody Stuart, D.D.</b>	
Sisera and Jacl . . . . .	306
<b>Rev. Charles Taylor, D.D.</b>	
The <i>Didaché</i> and Justin Martyr . . . . .	359
<b>Rev. Professor B. F. Westcott, D.D., D.C.L.</b>	
Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testa- ment :	
IV. Differences of Language Marked . . . . .	81
V. Vivid Details: Local and Temporal Colouring . . . . .	241
VI. Light upon the Christian Life. Conclusion . . . . .	401
<b>The Editor.</b>	
Dr. Maclaren . . . . .	64

## INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis i. 27 . . . . .	314	Psalms c. 3 . . . . .	52
i. 30 . . . . .	314	ciii. 20 . . . . .	314
iii. 8; iv. 6 . . . . .	325	civ. 4 . . . . .	48
vi. 1-4 . . . . .	325	cvii. 3 . . . . .	52
xv. 19 . . . . .	308	cx. 3 . . . . .	52
xxviii. 22 . . . . .	338	cxxxix. 3 . . . . .	39
xxxi. 19; xxxv. 4 . . . . .	332	cxxxix. 11 . . . . .	40
xxxv. 5 . . . . .	338	cxxxix. 13 . . . . .	40
xli. 45 . . . . .	332	cxxxix. 20 . . . . .	41
Exodus vi. 20 . . . . .	333	Proverbs . . . . .	76, 381
Joshua vii. 21 . . . . .	46	i. 17 . . . . .	383
xxiv. 14, 15 . . . . .	332	vii. 11 . . . . .	385
Judges iv. 17-23 . . . . .	30 <sup>a</sup> , 471	viii. 22 . . . . .	386
v. 30 . . . . .	46	xii. 27 . . . . .	388
1 Samuel xv. 6 . . . . .	308	Ecclesiastes . . . . .	76
xxx. 26, 29 . . . . .	308	Isaiah . . . . .	442
2 Samuel i. 24 . . . . .	46	vii. 16 . . . . .	444
2 Kings xxiii. 2, 3 . . . . .	334	ix. 3, 8 . . . . .	448
2 Chronicles xx. 21 . . . . .	52	x. 4 . . . . .	449
Ezra . . . . .	53	x. 27 . . . . .	451
Nehemiah . . . . .	287	xi. 11 . . . . .	450
ix. 26-34 . . . . .	336	xiv. 4 . . . . .	452
Job x. 11 . . . . .	40	xiv. 9 . . . . .	453
xix. 26 . . . . .	75	xiv. 31 . . . . .	454
xxxviii. 12-15 . . . . .	72	xvii. 9, 10 . . . . .	454
Psalms . . . . .	39	xvii. 13 . . . . .	455
vi. 2 . . . . .	43	xxi. 5 . . . . .	456
viii. 1 . . . . .	49	xxii. 11 . . . . .	41
xvi. 2 . . . . .	49	xxiii. 13 . . . . .	457
lx. 4 . . . . .	51	xxvi. 14, 19 . . . . .	458
lxii. 1 . . . . .	42	xxxiii. . . . .	459
lxvii. 6 . . . . .	47	Jeremiah xxi. 8 . . . . .	359
lxviii. 13 . . . . .	45	Amos . . . . .	161
lxix. 20 . . . . .	43, 44	v. 18, 19 . . . . .	170
lxxii. 15 . . . . .	52	viii. 5, 6 . . . . .	172
lxxiii. 21 . . . . .	44	Habakkuk ii. 20 . . . . .	43
lxxiv. 15 . . . . .	45	Zechariah ii. 13 . . . . .	43
lxxvi. 2, 3 . . . . .	44	Malachi . . . . .	414
lxxviii. 25 . . . . .	315	Matthew v. 44 . . . . .	364
lxxxiii. 14 . . . . .	45	xii. 45 . . . . .	83
xc. 4 . . . . .	46	xxii. 37 . . . . .	363
xci. 9 . . . . .	46	xxiv. 15, 16 . . . . .	175
xcv. 10 . . . . .	280	xxvi. 55 . . . . .	94

	PAGE		PAGE
Matthew xxvii. 15 . . . . .	94	2 Corinthians ii. 14 . . . . .	241
Mark ii. 5 . . . . .	87	iii. 18 . . . . .	246
xiii. 14 . . . . .	175	iv. 18 . . . . .	28
xvi. 11, 13, 16 . . . . .	86	v. 15 . . . . .	373
Luke iv. 4 . . . . .	316	v. 21 . . . . .	83
vi. 30 . . . . .	366	ix. 9 . . . . .	274
ix. 24 . . . . .	95	Galatians ii. 1-5 . . . . .	435
x. 36 . . . . .	83	ii. 20; v. 24; vi. 14 . . . . .	141
xxi. 20, 21 . . . . .	175	vi. 2, 5 . . . . .	98
John i. 8 . . . . .	96	vi. 17 . . . . .	241
i. 11 . . . . .	95	Ephesians ii. 21 . . . . .	318
i. 12 . . . . .	88	iv. 11 . . . . .	22, 26
iii. 10, 11 . . . . .	84	iv. 12 . . . . .	92
vi. 51, 58 . . . . .	274	Philippians . . . . .	113
viii. 30, 31 . . . . .	91	i. 1 . . . . .	24, 351
viii. 35 . . . . .	274	i. 13 . . . . .	125
ix. 39 . . . . .	83	ii. 6 . . . . .	129
x. 16 . . . . .	94	ii. 25 . . . . .	128
xiii. 7 . . . . .	84	Colossians ii. 11, 12, 20; iii. 1 . . . . .	142
xiii. 10 . . . . .	97	1 Thessalonians v. 12 . . . . .	4, 208
xiv. 13, 14 . . . . .	191	2 Thessalonians ii. 2; Romans	
xvi. 2 . . . . .	241	xiii. 12 . . . . .	97
xvi. 19 . . . . .	85	1 Timothy iii. 2 . . . . .	351
Acts ii. 46 . . . . .	315	iii. 13; v. 17 . . . . .	203
iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30 . . . . .	89	iv. 14 . . . . .	26
vi. 1 . . . . .	347	v. 6 . . . . .	146
xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18;		2 Timothy i. 10 . . . . .	88
Gal. ii. 12 . . . . .	25	ii. 11 . . . . .	145
xiv. 23 . . . . .	207	iv. 5 . . . . .	26
xx. 17 . . . . .	24, 353	iv. 21 . . . . .	27
xx. 28 . . . . .	20, 24, 403	Titus i. 5 . . . . .	353
xx. 34 . . . . .	114	Philemon 12-14 . . . . .	150
Romans . . . . .	99	15-19 . . . . .	180
i. 20 . . . . .	89	20-25 . . . . .	297
iii. 25 . . . . .	89	Hebrews i. 1-4 . . . . .	254
iii. 25, 26 . . . . .	376	vii. 21 . . . . .	86
v. 6-10 . . . . .	374	xii. 7 . . . . .	411
vi. 2, 3, 6, 8 . . . . .	141	1 Peter ii. 25 . . . . .	20
vi. 23 . . . . .	406	2 Peter ii. 12 . . . . .	413
vii. 4 . . . . .	376	1 John i. 5-7 . . . . .	397
viii. 24 . . . . .	401	iii. 1 . . . . .	88
xi. 29 . . . . .	86	3 John . . . . .	213
xii. 2 . . . . .	85	Jude 13 . . . . .	274
1 Corinthians xii. 4 . . . . .	90	Revelation iii. 21 . . . . .	148
xii. 28 . . . . .	22	iv. 6; v. 6; vi. 1 . . . . .	93
xiv. . . . .	22	xii. 3; xiii. 1 . . . . .	93

20













